

NOV 19 1941

The QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 550

OCTOBER, 1941.

Vol. 277

1. Britain at War.
By Lord Gorell, C.B.E., M.C.
 2. King Edward VII.
By Sir Charles Petrie, Bt. XDA
 3. French Military Training for Defeat.
By Brigadier E. D. H. Tollemache, D.S.O., M.C.
 4. The Work and Future of the City Churches.
By Rev. James Wall.
 5. The Earlier Years of Kaiser Wilhelm.
By the late Sir Valentine Chirol. Arranged by
Captain A. L. Kennedy, M.C.
 6. Birds and Agriculture.
By Eric Hardy, F.Z.S.
 7. Germany as a Spiritual and World Problem.
By E. Müller-Sturmheim.
 8. The General Hospital Service.
By C. E. A. Bedwell.
 9. Indian Politics, 1940-41.
By Sir Verney Lovett, K.C.S.I.
 10. The Church and the Outlook.
By The Very Rev. The Dean of Winchester.
- Some Recent Books.

Published Quarterly by
THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Sole Agents for American Continent

131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK

Single Copies, \$1.75

Yearly Subscription, \$6.50

Entered at New York Post Office as Second Class Matter
LONDON: JOHN MURRAY

TO SUBSCRIBERS

AND AGENCIES

Commencing with the January 1938 issue of the "QUARTERLY REVIEW," Subscribers will be supplied by the INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY, 131 VARICK STREET, NEW YORK CITY, to whom all renewals and enquiries regarding this periodical should be sent.

THE QUARTERLY REVIEW

No. 550.—OCTOBER 1941.

Art. 1.—BRITAIN AT WAR.

SPECULATION from the outside on all public events is difficult, and in most cases impossible of accurate achievement, and this is particularly true of events affecting most nations in time of war ; but it may well be doubted whether there has ever before in history been a war with so many twists and turns in it as this. It is the more noticeable because the end to which all move has never really been in doubt : we have been through times of immense difficulty, stress, and peril, but even in the darkest hours, those following the fall of France, June and July, 1940, it was practically impossible to find any Englishman or Englishwoman who doubted the ultimate and complete victory of the cause for which we took up arms—on the contrary, in one rural area with which I am intimately acquainted, an area remote from most modern influences where the inner spirit of this island abides little changed century after century, there was in those dark hours only one fear, that the nation would be let down by its Government, not treacherously or through vile self-seeking as has been the hapless lot of many another nation, but through lack of what we vulgarly, but expressively, call 'guts': it is not the least of the many great services rendered to us by Mr Winston Churchill that this fear at any rate was speedily dispelled.

There have been times, beyond dispute, when, whatever our own inmost convictions of ultimate victory, it was not difficult to understand the arrogant jubilation of our enemies : everything seemed to be going their way, even as it did on occasion in the last war, and their belief in their power to enforce their will upon the world had obvious facts to support it. That is so no longer. However essential it may be, especially for such a race of

Vol. 277.—No. 550.

easy-goers as the British characteristically are, given half a chance, to shun facile optimism like the plague, it has become increasingly difficult to understand how any German—except the entirely doped and ignorant—can entertain any real hope of final success. And yet it remains true that the twists and turns of this gigantic conflict are incalculable. Who, for instance, among any of the large band of prophets, public, journalistic, or private, could ever have forecast, at one period of the war, when we were shoulder to shoulder with our old ally, France, and showing the keenest sympathy for the very gallant struggle of the little Finnish people against the onslaught on their territory of the Russian armies, that in the succeeding year we should, after stubborn fighting to rescue from the treachery of France Syria and its terribly important threat, be allied with Russia who was engaged in a vast struggle against attack by Germany in part of which Finland was assisting? Such transmogrifications make no sense: unhappily they have become inevitable in an era in the so-called civilisation of mankind when a large number of big nations have abandoned all principle except the single one of expediency. For these the only law has become the law of the jungle—‘let him take who has the power and let him keep who can’—and it is a basic necessity for the onward march of humanity that that, wherever adopted, should be resisted to the death—and utterly defeated.

I lay special emphasis upon the incalculable nature of the twists and turns of this war in view of the difficulties surrounding any writer. I received a proof of my last article, written on May 14, in time to add a short postscript on May 28: in the fortnight's interval ‘five events of outstanding significance for the future of the world’—as I then described them—had taken place. The first of these was the Battle of Crete which had then been raging for seven nights and seven days: how long, how very long, ago that already seems! Yet it is only now that it is possible to attempt to fit that heroic resistance into its place in the whole gigantic plan of the enemy-onslaught.*

* To those who still feel that it was nothing less than a disaster the considered verdict of General Wavell, uttered at Simla to-day, may be commended: ‘Enemy losses in Crete have certainly cost the Germans Iraq and Syria,’ and he might also have added Iran (September 3).

We are now—I write on August 15—at the threshold of the third year of the war: it is legitimate to strike a balance sheet. Certain factors stand out a mile. First, whatever may still betide in the air, the date last year was the date of the Battle of Britain—it was on August 15, 1940, that the Germans lost one of their most spectacular numbers of attacking planes and this year it is the Royal Air Force that is doing the attacking till the date may almost be called that of the Battle of Germany. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the vastness of the significance of the change. Then, as now, we were daily being warned of the possibilities, even the probabilities, of invasion; we remained with our heads 'bloody but unbowed' last year, we have reason now for more than resolute optimism.

Secondly, for reasons which to the private observer at least remain exceedingly obscure, 'Hitlerite Germany,' to use the recently adopted Government phraseology, decided on June 22 to change Russia from a dubious comrade into an adamant foe. It seems probable that this was always Hitler's intention but that his hand was forced as to the date and that his original plan was very different, to absorb the Balkans bloodlessly, squeeze Turkey into defencelessness, and outdo Alexander in a mighty march to the East and the oil. As long ago as July 11, the 'Spectator's' expert commentator expressed the view that 'Hitler's *blitzkrieg* against Russia has definitely failed'; that was a bold and, no doubt, a premature pronouncement. By October when this article appears, its truth may or may not have been established; in mid-August one can only say that it is obvious that the Russian resistance has been infinitely more stubborn, more skilful, and more effective than any one—except, possibly, M. Stalin—ever dreamed it would, or could, be, and that in consequence the German onslaught and the appalling losses in men and material in which it has involved him may well prove to be the most disastrous of all Hitler's many blunders.

Thirdly, there is—in mid-August be it remembered, by October the obscurity will exist no longer—the dark cloud over the Far East caused by the insensate gambling ambitions of a group of men in control of Japan. Sheer madness from the point of view of Japan, it would seem, but 'those whom the gods wish to destroy they first make

mad,' and, weighed in the scales of divine justice, the crimes of Japan against China are so terrible that destruction may well have been decreed. And so the world stands, as I write, on the brink of such an extension of conflict as would truly justify the name, which was only partially earned a quarter of a century ago, of World War.

Fourthly, we are faced with the tragedy of France, an event far more lamentable in the sphere of spiritual values than her fall last year. She fell fighting and no one is dishonoured who falls with face still toward the enemy, but to-day——! France has had a tortured history throughout the centuries; she has fallen often, she has been rent with feud and faction, she has known disgrace, she has been luminous with glory, but never before in all her history has she sunk officially so low as under the degraded opportunism of a Darlan. It is a sign of the terrific nature of these times through which we are now living that on June 9, when I was travelling by train, and had been unable to buy a paper, a naval officer in my carriage kindly lent me his, saying as he handed it over, 'There's nothing in it to-day'—it in fact contained the announcement of our entry into Syria, that poignant, but essential, campaign—now (August 15) referred to by Admiral Darlan in his broadcast to the Vichy forces as 'increasing still further their patrimony of glory in the same spirit of glory' as Dunkirk and Flanders, words which almost make one despair of the logical power of the human mind!

On the day we marched into Damascus, Hitler crashed into Russia, the British saying little and doing their utmost to assuage the bitterness of conflict with any Frenchman, the Germans announcing themselves as the saviours of Europe against Bolshevism and fighting, as usual, with ruthless brutality: 'between what matters and what seems to matter,' asked Mr E. C. Bentley in the first sentence of his famous story 'Trent's Last Case,' 'how should the world we know judge wisely?'

Finally, and excluding all the many other lesser items of credit and debit in this world blood-bath, when I wrote the postscript to my last article on May 28 I was writing on the day after President Roosevelt's 'fireside chat'; to-day I write on the day after the Proclamation of 8 Points made in mid-Atlantic jointly by the President of

the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain. In between these two much water has flowed, irresistibly if not conspicuously, under the world's bridges: let us pause for a moment to see what has been borne along upon its eddies. It was Mr Raymond Gram Swing who described the speech of May 27 as 'the end of debate and the beginning of action'; there were many who felt that to be pure hyperbole, even though a month later, after ten thousand million dollars had been voted for the United States Army, Mr Swing hailed the signature of Mr Ford to his armament contract as 'the end of resistance by big business to unionism.' Do we yet realise, I wonder, how like a vast drag-net this war is drawing along fishes big and fishes small, fishes near and fishes remote, all together in one tremendous catch, to be spilled out one day not so very far distant on the golden sands of human opportunity?

A further month—the 27th seems to have had an attraction for American speakers—and Mr Harry Hopkins, the President's personal representative, was declaring on July 27, in accents of directness and simplicity, 'formerly the Atlantic divided us, now it unites us . . . you are not fighting alone.' But I must interpolate that deep-voiced, sarcastic address to Dr Goebbels delivered by Mr Quentin Reynolds: he ended, it may be recalled, by telling the 'Dr' that there was only one difference between the people of the United States and the people of this island, that they drove on the right and we drove on the left, but that we would both drive together to Berlin—at least one listener said drily, 'There is one other difference; we're at war and the Americans are not.' It is perhaps as well—within strict limits—to obey the very earnest and entirely friendly advice of yet another American speaker, Mr Herbert Agar, who begged us not to be too polite to the United States. Politeness is not as a rule one of the most usual of our virtues, but we have one and all been careful to exert it to the full to 'the arsenal of democracy.' If any Briton wished specially to be caustic, he could hardly do better than invite Senator James Mead to consider dispassionately, if he would, how strangely on British ears it sounded to hear that he was expatiating about 'the rising tide of criticism of Britain's war effort'—in comparison, did he mean,

with America's? And could he tell us his authority for saying that 'the invasion of England probably will not come off?' But such verboriousities trouble few but their makers and unquestionably in no way whatever impair the immensity of our appreciation of American generosity and assistance.

Now comes the joint Proclamation of 8 Points. Let us remember that Woodrow Wilson put out his famous 14 Points alone, if we wish to realise the real significance of this unity of expression. Not many weeks before this the Bishop of New York, Dr Manning, addressing his annual diocesan convention, used the following words:

'We should now take our full and open part in this conflict and give our military and naval authorities power to take whatever action in their judgment will be most effective in conjunction with Great Britain. Speaking as an American, as a Christian, and as a bishop of the Christian Church, I say that it is our duty as a nation to take our full part in this struggle.'

The delegates, we are told, 'rose *en masse* and applauded the Bishop's address.' Remarkable and memorable, and if we here, in this embattled island, feel any temptation to murmur with Hamlet, 'words, words, words,' there is to support those who feel that words are not action the view of that great American, Dr Nicholas Murray Butler, written on May 16: after saying, 'For forty years there has been convincing and steadily growing evidence of the fact that the people of the United States were ready and willing to assume a commanding part in the organisation of the civilised world in order to protect prosperity and international peace,' he adds the question, 'Why is it, then, that nothing has been done about it?' It is a question, he feels 'humiliating' for democracy. At all events the emotional and spiritual appeal of Dr Manning has been powerfully reinforced by the political reasoning of that distinguished American publicist, Mr Walter Lippman. ('What d'you read?' . . . 'I read Voltaire,' replied the New Yorker, a Jew. . . . 'Voltaire?' . . . 'Yes, Voltaire Lippman.') This is what he has written:

'What can be our basic aim in the peace settlement except to establish firmly this time what we should never have lost the last time: a firm, enduring partnership in world affairs

among the English-speaking peoples . . . if we are to have as we can have, not another twenty years of false peace but a century of order and tranquillity, then never again must the free peoples of the Atlantic world become disunited and feeble.'

It is interesting and, I hope, apposite, to quote such reasoning immediately after the heads of the English-speaking peoples have met in the midst of the Atlantic world and proclaimed their common faith. There are those who were disappointed at the omissions from that Proclamation; it had been heralded with all the journalistic boosting that seems to be inseparable from this age; the whole Empire had been invited to listen in to 'an important pronouncement' by Mr Attlee, and, when listened in to, some have been found to complain that there was nothing in it which was not already perfectly well-known and accepted. There have been other listeners who at once acclaimed it as 'the most momentous announcement in the history of the world.' You pay your money (or your blood) and you take your choice.

The truth, I think, is that in an age so terrifically sensational when the newspapers record, almost unemotionally, that 9,000,000 men are engaged in a death-grapple on an 1,800-mile front from Murmansk to Odessa our appetites are jaded: it needs to be something extremely startling to stir us. The Proclamation was not—as some had hoped, since all were speculating about 'the worst-kept secret of the war' (which, in American parlance, is saying some)—a declaration of action: it made no mention, for example, of Japan; but it was in essence much more, it was a declaration of common principle, of fundamental aims. And, which is what matters most to a people at war, it was so much waste paper unless both signatories intended to do all in their power to give effect to the achievement of those aims. At any rate and whatever be the outcome and events of these supremely important weeks which divide us now from the beginning of the third winter of the war, I for one hold that this Proclamation is one of the great turning-points of history. It links the British Commonwealth and the United States together openly and categorically in the forward and upward march of Man, and from it there can be no receding without weakness or dishonour.

And, let it be emphasised, with it is associated the message to M. Stalin and promise of speedy maximum aid to Russia. Furthermore—and much more—this Proclamation and this promise are only the outward and published signs of all that was discussed and agreed. So much is perfectly apparent. Irrevocably this mid-Atlantic meeting has sealed the doom of Hitler and everything for which that satanic monster and his satellites stand.

It is time for me to return home, back to this singular little island which carries on marvellously unmoved through times of storm and times of transient sun. We have now the great nation of Russia as our ally—Mr Winston Churchill's instant broadcast on the evening of June 22 was, in my humble opinion, the finest and most statesmanlike of all his speeches—and, whatever fate befall the Russian forces between now and October, their resistance has drastically changed the balance of power. But we were at war with Germany before June 22, 1941, and no less determined on victory before than after. The one apprehension that obviously beset our rulers was lest we should fold our arms and idle, and that has not happened. It was said after Munich that when Hitler reminded Neville Chamberlain that this time Germany had Italy on her side, Chamberlain replied, 'Well, that's perfectly fair; we had her last time.' If we have lost—not the soul of France but the body, Vichy and Darlan not the oriflamme and de Gaulle, we have gained Russia: if Japan is our enemy, the United States is our friend. And how pleased the Italians really were at the sinking of the Bismarck!

There is still plenty of humour in the world if one can only find it, and in this little island it continues to abound. For the curious indomitableness of the ordinary English citizen there is the reply of an old woman called upon to leave her house quickly after a night of 'blitz' in London on account of a large, unexploded bomb in an adjacent garden, 'but I haven't washed up the breakfast things yet.' For humour there is the comment of the short, stout Home Guardsman, a member of the Company I have the honour to command, on the replacement of his summer denims by battle-dress; ruefully he remarked, 'my last pair of trousers I could button over my shoulders, but I've never had a pair before that went over my head.'

Or the notice on a bombed shop-front in the City, 'Germany, you may use your fleet v. England.' Finally, amongst remarks overheard, the matter of fact acceptance by those in the Forces of their changed financial circumstances, 'I've worked it out,' said a cheery gunner to his pal; 'I get $\frac{1}{2}$ d. an hour. But it's enough, there's nothing I can spend it on,' and he laughed. Not quite the same point of view as that of some factory hands who were asking an R.A.F. pilot about his rates of pay: finding, somewhat to their embarrassment, that one of 'the few to whom the many owe so much' was getting considerably less a week than they were, they said hastily, 'But of course we work during "alerts".' Therein lies much food for thought; it establishes as fact what we all vowed after the last war should never happen again.

Exceptions there are in any land and always will be; but, as the humble folk of England, Wales, Scotland—yes, and of Ireland also—settle down with a kind of grim cheerfulness peculiar to these islands to go through another winter, in which, for all they know, they may any one of them be called upon again to endure hardship, exist through danger, or be surrounded by destruction, may we not write of them words written a good many years ago now? I have quoted the first words of Mr E. C. Bentley's best-known book; let me quote in this connection the first words of Charles Reade's 'The Cloister and the Hearth': 'not a day passes over the earth but men and women of no note do great deeds, speak great words, and suffer noble sorrows'; they are preferable to the words of cold contempt Hitler has showered upon 'men and women of no note' in that eccentricity of egomania, 'Mein Kampf.'

England, quiet, unconquered, little England. 'Wow, what a place!' exclaimed a Canadian soldier billeted in one of her smaller villages. 'When the war's over, they're really going to celebrate; they're going to light the lamps at *both* ends of the street!' England carries on, astonishingly the same, almost at times incomprehensibly so: at a cricket match at Lord's this summer the first spectator to turn up was scrupulously attired in a morning coat and top-hat—and he had not, as far as is known, mistaken it for a funeral! His attire was all the more commendable in view of the descent upon us of clothes rationing. It is

difficult to understand some of the comparative values, but then that was perhaps inevitable, as I suppose that at least 90 per cent. of shopping is done by women and there is no evidence that any woman was so much as consulted in the preparation of the scheme. The one real concession to femininity is that a wife may make use of her husband's coupons—and presumably she does : would that be a justifiable cause for divorce ?

But, though we may jest about 'trousis' and 'blousis'—to quote the old song—eggs are altogether another kettle of fish, if the expression may be pardoned ; and as for fuel—it would not be allowable to inscribe in any respectable pages the expressions of popular criticisms. Who amongst the hierarchy of the great Civil Service invented that beautifully omnibus word 'household !' It covers a cottage, it envelopes a castle : a household was only allowed to keep the produce of 12 hens, whether the household had 2 or 20 in it to feed, until a wave of destructive criticism caused that stupidity to evaporate, though not before many a man of conscience and small holding had destroyed hens above the mystic dozen, a result that almost any one out of Whitehall could have foretold. But, though 'household' fell down over eggs, it has bobbed up as cheerfully as ever (in fact, as sure as eggs !) over fuel ; the various newspapers have printed as devastating a set of letters about the crassness of the prevailing regulation, one ton per household, as it is possible to conceive—and we are all getting a trifle annoyed at being told one month that we are unpatriotic, if not positively illegal, in trying to do the very thing we were insistently pressed to do the month before. Being British, we put up with it all, and gather good cheer from some of the stories of German muddles which percolate through the small mesh of continental censorship.

It is perhaps characteristic of us as a people that whenever the war situation is encouraging we begin, one and all, to let off steam. I noted down one week in July as the best week militarily and the worst politically. The House of Commons quite rose in its grousing and gave tongue in a manner that in the days of peace would probably have led to a General Election. But now-a-days politically we are in a very singular position ; there is no one (not even Mr Shinwell) who, whatever his previous

opinions or prejudices, can have anything but admiration for that blend of pugnacity and eloquence which is the predominating strain in our Prime Minister; no one desires, or could contemplate, a change. Mr Churchill exactly suits the nation and the hour: of that there can be no doubt whatever. But—and it really is rather a big 'but,' though obviously in war-time it cannot be allowed to have its due share of weight—his team comes in for a refreshingly large measure of criticism; in fact, many remain unknown to the public by name, if not by office, and of others it might be said that it would not be altogether a loss if they similarly so remained. At all events, even if we need not agree with the cynical commentator about the Ministerial team whom I quoted in the April 'Quarterly,' we are governed in this greatest of wars by a team that seem sometimes to announce decisions, then await the obvious criticisms, and thirdly bow to these, after an interval, with no very good grace: that was the way of the Stuarts, and for our part we British prefer the way of Queen Elizabeth.

One of the chief and most justifiable of the general criticisms is that the Government does not govern: Ministers, when all is said and done, constitute the authority that knows, or ought to know: their job is to govern, not alternately cajole and scold. Consider three recent demonstrations of ineffectiveness. We are told, first, that Hitler may yet use gas in a desperate attempt to subdue us: does the Government order us to carry masks? Not a bit: almost plaintively it announces that it cannot do that as such an order would be difficult to enforce—there is no policeman in the land who would feel the slightest difficulty about enforcing an order, if for example, one needed to be made about wearing an article of attire normally deemed essential, such as trousers. Secondly, we are bombarded with appeals, pathetic, sentimental, or downright silly, to keep children away from areas such as London which are liable to be bombed: national money has gone to the sending of them away and that can be wasted at will. And, thirdly, perhaps the most pointed instance of all, we all were begged not to travel on or around the August Bank Holiday and told there could be no extra facilities if we did. Many thousands ignored the begging and instead

of having to pay the, or any, penalty had additional trains put on for their disobedient benefit. The nation needs no Prussian dragooning, but it looks to the Government to govern, and when those who know decide that something is essential, or at all events desirable, for the winning of the war, it asks with growing emphasis that they should insist on it.

The same thing applies to what are now euphemistically known as 'black markets': the average man in the street, or, still more, the average woman in the kitchen, knows quite well both the temptations and the difficulties, but, even apart from the egg *betise*, he—and, still more, she—is growing a trifle exasperated at the self-complacency that exudes from so many Government Departments, and certainly not least from the Ministry of Food, like the aroma traditionally associated with the 'effortless superiority' of Lord Curzon. If, just occasionally, a Minister could admit that he, or his office, had made what schoolboys called a 'bloomer'—when it is perfectly obvious to all concerned that he, or it, has—then quite a little sigh of relief, if not of contentment, would go up and he would be forgiven with a shrug and a smile. But these impeccable Ministers—what is to be their fate? There seems to be a law of the Medes and Persians that none can ever be cast out into the outer darkness of a return to private life; and there cannot, in the nature of things, be an inexhaustible supply of new posts to push them out to fill.

It will be apparent that from Lieut-Colonel Austin Hopkinson upwards—or downwards, according to individual opinion—the nation is re-establishing its democratic rights of grumbling; it certainly was not pleased with the Ministry of Information, it certainly was left with an uneasy feeling of dissatisfaction at the end of the first debate on production. Nor was it entirely happy at the end of the second debate: the Prime Minister, it was almost universally felt, ought not to feel either that criticism spells disappointment with him personally or that he must be the invariable protagonist. When so much has been said, all has been said: there is no question but that the nation, and the Empire, will follow him wholeheartedly wheresoever he leads them on the road to victory, there is happily also no question that he has any

lack of understanding of the mind, moods, and direction of the great republic across the ocean. To the hour the man: that has always been the fortunate heritage of Great Britain—it is not absent now.

Of one thing we must be conscious, however full of grumbles we become at what is universally termed 'red tape,' but may perhaps more reasonably be termed the checks and balances inherent in a Civil Service brought up to conserve rather than to spend. I remember well once having an eminent Civil Servant pointed out to me as the ablest man who had served the Treasury. I asked in what specially resided his ability and received the answer that he was the best man who had sat in his particular office for saying 'no' who had ever been—it seemed to me at the time, and still more to-day, but one half of the work assigned to him. 'Get into the Bath and stay there,' was the succinct advice given to one young aspirant by an elderly and much decorated civil servant. What we must recognise, whatever the grumbings and whatever the joking, is that to-day more even than ever the Civil Service is bearing a crushing burden, and bearing it resolutely without either advertisement or complaint. Many of its members, even highly placed seniors, are always at their offices, by night as well as by day: meeting one recently and thinking he looked tired, I asked him if he were not going to have a holiday; 'I had eight days off last year,' he said simply. No doubt that is much to be deprecated; war-work of high administrative class needs a fresh, and not a wearied, brain, but it says volumes for the quiet devotion with which these necessary new Ministries are being guided and these constant in-and-out Ministers shepherded.

It was a good many weeks ago that a man of experience in the City remarked to me that he felt we had come to 'the stickiest point of the war': that was shortly before the former All-Highest had had military honours allowed him at his funeral by an ignoble Austrian who had failed in his early ambition to become a successful artist and had become instead successively a corporal, a Nazi, a tyrant, and a by-word. And Russia has happened since then. Storm-clouds collect in every quarter of the globe; no one dare say what new nations, big or small, may not rush in, or be compelled in, to the holocaust

before the end is in sight. No one can say where the blatant, blaring, beastly brutality of the mechanized might of Germany may not seek yet to thrust its murderous way. But some things are growing clear, and all are heavy in the scales against our gross and ghastly enemy. The Near East, not long since so fearfully beleaguered, is transformed; the skies, once the ranging-grounds of the German, are daily and nightly more conspicuously ours; wide as the dripping claws of the blond beast have stretched, they cannot relax anywhere one instant—a detestation of the aggressor has arisen without parallel in mankind. ‘Oil, oil, give us oil!’ the cry begins to arise from the thousands of thirsty machines. Look where he will to-day, Hitler can see—victories perhaps, crushed and writhing peoples in tormented subjection to the blood-stained jack-boot of the Gestapo, but beyond these inexorably nearer, fiercer, mightier the forces of the free that are grinding him and his to powder. The summer is ending, the autumn is at hand; after autumn falls the long darkness, the cold, and the dread. In every possible way and degree we are better equipped to face all three and to widen from resistance to attack: what must be the real thoughts of the German people now as they scan the skies from which descended, in the hey-day of their fury, destruction on Rotterdam, Prague, and many another hapless city? Will they be saying, as we can say, ‘if Winter comes, can Spring be far behind?’

GORELL.

September 3. The world enters to-day upon the third year of this terrific conflict. Within the last forty-eight hours two further events of deep significance have come to greet us:

(a) The British and Russian forces, advancing through Iran, have clasped hands at Sehneh. This is more than a great strategical success, it is more than a presentation of fresh ramparts to Turkey, ‘the bastion of the Middle East,’ as she has been called, in that by this union the Allies ‘say nay’ (if a very bad pun may be permitted) to the infiltrations, to be succeeded by subversive occupation, of Germany; the road to the East is barred to our enemies and is opened for ourselves to Russia. But, more

than that—and that is of supreme importance—this hand-clasp is symbolic of an alliance which, if well and wisely used, may be of incalculable interest and value to the future of the world after the war.

(b) President Roosevelt, broadcasting to the great democracy he rules, has declared: 'I know I speak for the conscience and determination of the American people when I say we shall do everything in our power to crush Hitler and his Nazi forces'—notably strong words to be used deliberately by the head of a nation technically neutral!

Art. 2.—KING EDWARD VII.

ON Nov. 9, 1841, King Edward VII was born, and on May 6, 1910, he died : to a generation which is engaged in a desperate struggle for its very existence the two dates may well appear equally remote and unimportant, but in reality this is far from being the case. It was in no small measure due to King Edward VII that the British monarchy was enabled to survive the storm which swept away so many thrones during the second decade of the present century, and to secure that universal acceptance which has enabled it so effectively to symbolise the unity of nation and Empire. Nor is this all, for he was one of the first to realise the threat of Prussianised Germany, and his initiative and statesmanship played a large part in building up that alliance which enabled civilisation to withstand the first onrush of the Teutonic hordes twenty-five years ago. The centenary, therefore, of King Edward's birth is not only a milestone in British history, for it evokes memories of the past which have a definite bearing upon the present and the future.

Although nearly a generation has elapsed since King Edward died it is not yet possible to pass a final judgment upon his career, more particularly after he ascended the throne, for some of his ministers, notably Mr Winston Churchill, are still alive, and until all of these are dead some documents must necessarily remain unpublished. Then, again, the King's own letters have not, save for a limited selection edited some years ago by Lieut-Colonel J. P. C. Sewell, been given to the world, although, as it is not without interest to note, those of his mother began to make their appearance only six years after her death. Nevertheless it is unlikely that future disclosures will materially affect our opinion, save, perhaps, on one or two points, so that it is already possible to obtain a very fair picture both of the monarch and the man.

As Prince of Wales he has been compared with Shakespeare's Prince Hal, who became the model monarch King Henry V, and there is something in the comparison, though it must be remembered that even in his feverish youth he never allowed his pleasures to interfere with the performance of his duties. What, too, is often forgotten

in this connection is that no Prince of Wales ever had to serve so long an apprenticeship for monarchy as he did, for at the time of his accession he was in his sixtieth year. His education had been of the most deplorable and unsuitable kind, under the well-intentioned, but wholly misguided, direction of the Prince Consort and Baron Stockmar. Queen Victoria not only inherited that attitude of suspicion towards the Heir Apparent which marked all the rulers of the House of Hanover, but, with the passage of time and under the influence of Prince Albert, she became obsessed with the fear that her eldest son might come to resemble her uncles in general, and the so-called First Gentleman of Europe in particular. Unhappily, in her attempt to prevent such a development she adopted, like so many parents in every walk of life, the very methods most calculated to produce the result she was at such pains to avoid.

When the Prince came of age, shortly after his father's early death, the Queen refused to allow him to have any regular and responsible employment, so that he was compelled to expend his enormous energies, and to dissipate his great and growing powers, on a number of petty, and in some cases unworthy, pursuits. Such, rather than any real tendency to vice, was the explanation of the Tranby Croft scandal and of the Prince's appearance in the Mordaunt case. Yet he travelled widely, both abroad and in the Empire; he took the lead in many notable philanthropic movements, especially those which had as their object the provision of houses and hospitals for the poorer classes; and he did a great deal to raise the tone of sport. From politics, however, he was excluded. In vain one Premier after another, Conservative and Liberal alike, implored the Queen to give him some work to do, whether it was to learn the routine of Government departments, to go through the discipline of the Army, to administer India, or, above all, to live in Ireland as his mother's representative. The Queen was adamant in her refusal, 'evidently haunted,' to quote Professor Hearnshaw, 'by the fear that Albert Edward if allowed any independence would develop the undesirable filial features of one or other of the four Georges.' Queen Victoria was a great monarch, but she was a poor mother to her eldest son. In the circumstances the astonishing thing is not

that the latter kicked over the traces so much, but that he did it so little.

Both as Prince and King he touched life at many points, and that was not the least of the reasons for his success. Society in the Victorian era despised what it called 'trade,' though such an attitude was somewhat illogical on the part of the children and grandchildren of 'nabobs' and of the profiteers of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars. There was, too, an exclusiveness about the Court which was largely due to the German origin of the dynasty, but which was also to some extent the result of the unpopularity of the earlier Georges. Queen Victoria's outlook in these matters was influenced by that of the Prince Consort, and this was typically Teutonic. The Queen would never have sat down to dinner with a playwright, as Louis XIV had done with Molière, but her eldest son revived, to the great advantage of the Royal Family, the older and more generous traditions of the monarchy. Both before and after he ascended the throne he delighted to honour any who showed themselves worthy, whatever their origin, and he brought royalty into personal contact with far wider sections of the population than had been the case since the fall of the Stuarts.

There might be one or two people at Marlborough House or Buckingham Palace who need not have been received there, and the standard of aristocratic behaviour may have fallen somewhat in the opening years of the twentieth century, but the country as a whole rejoiced in the revival of the old pageantry of the monarchy which followed the death of Queen Victoria. The importance of this aspect of the King's activities can hardly be over-rated, and so the man-in-the-street, who had respected the old Queen, came to love 'Teddy' as his ancestors had loved 'Old Rowley.' During the dark days of the Four Years' War it was no rare thing to hear the remark: 'This wouldn't have happened if Teddy had been alive'—an observation which, whether true or not, testified to the affection in which King Edward VII was held by his subjects. Nobody would have described him as an erudite, or even as a moderately well-read, man, but he kept in touch with many distinguished artists and men of letters through such personal friends as Lord Leighton.

The remarkable thing about the King's attitude was that this broadening of the basis of the throne was effected without any cheapening of royalty. King Edward was no Louis Philippe. No one was more particular in matters of etiquette or dress than he, and there are many anecdotes of the quickness with which he would notice the least departure from propriety in either. Yet with the mass of the people he was more popular than any monarch since Charles II, and it was largely because he shared in the amusements of a sport-loving nation. Illogical as it may appear to the philosopher, his three successes at the Derby forged a link between him and his fellow-countrymen which meant more than all the provisions of the Constitution. Moreover, except perhaps during the last two years of his life, when a profound melancholy was creeping over him, he always looked cheerful in public, and this goes a long way with the man-in-the-street. In short, it is not too much to say that the work of King Edward VII in this sphere, following on that of his mother, was of the utmost assistance to his successor in a revolutionary age, when every institution, human and divine, was called in question.

Of King Edward's relations with his ministers, and of his influence upon the working of the Constitution, it is not easy to speak with any confidence, for much of the necessary evidence is not yet available. He was not very interested in domestic politics, except in their broader aspects, and, like his successor, he had little patience with anything which in his opinion savoured too much of the 'parish pump.' Whenever possible he did his best to soften the asperities of party strife. For example, when the Conservative Government resigned in December 1905, he asked Mr Walter Long, the retiring Chief Secretary for Ireland, to get into touch with Mr Bryce, who was to succeed him, and, to quote Mr Long,

'tell him quite frankly and freely what are your views of the difficulties connected with the Government of Ireland apart from the question of Home Rule; what you believe to be the most essential details of administration; and, in other words, give him the benefit of your knowledge and experience just as you would if you were being followed by some political friend of your own.'

During King Edward's reign there were four Prime Ministers, namely, Lord Salisbury, Mr Balfour, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and Mr Asquith. The first of these resigned office before the King had been long upon the throne, and during the period of his Premiership the pre-occupation of the Government was the termination of the South African War. With Lord Salisbury's successor the King was never on very easy terms, and there was a marked contrast in the temperaments of the two men. King Edward was a man of the world in the best sense of that much-abused term, while about Mr Balfour there was, it must be confessed, a good deal of the intellectual snob. The King, in his idle moments, read French novels, and the Prime Minister, on similar occasions, volumes of German philosophy, so it is hardly surprising that monarch and minister should have had widely different outlooks. King Edward also distrusted the Premier's secretary Mr J. S. Sandars, whose influence over his chief was considerable, and there was a strong Whig element in the Government, Conservative though it nominally was, which was hardly likely to see eye to eye with the sovereign in constitutional matters.

With his two Liberal Prime Ministers, on the other hand, and particularly with Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, King Edward's relations were a great deal more cordial, and this lent colour to the popular belief among Conservatives at the time that the monarch was a Radical and a Home Ruler. The Liberals were also more tactful in their dealings with the King, and although the latter was sometimes irritated by the outbursts of Mr Lloyd George, he was able to work with Sir Henry and Mr Asquith in a more friendly spirit than with the previous administration; in particular, he did a great deal to ensure the success of Mr Haldane's Army reforms and of Lord Fisher's reconstruction of the Navy. What would have happened had he lived a few years longer, and been confronted with the House of Lords and Ulster crises, it is impossible to say, but his wisdom and tact might have removed some of the bitterness which marked party politics in the period immediately preceding the Four Years' War. With Mr Joseph Chamberlain, who had in his earlier days been the bugbear of Queen Victoria, the King's relations were always cordial, and there was an

additional bond between the two men in the fact that their elder sons had been friends at Cambridge.

The success of King Edward VII in reviving the old pageantry that was associated with the monarchy in the past cannot, however, conceal the fact that during his reign the Crown steadily lost ground from the constitutional standpoint. While he was on the throne most of the great prerogatives were challenged, and in each case the King was forced to give way : in this connection, too, it is not without interest to note that these limitations of the prerogative were mainly due to the efforts of the Conservatives. For example, when a cession of territory was necessary as a result of the conclusion of the Franco-British Entente in 1904, Mr Balfour took the view that the consent of Parliament was essential, while he also held the opinion not only that the House of Commons could insist upon a dissolution but also that ministers might be selected or dismissed by the Premier without reference to the Crown. The exact working of the Constitution under King Edward VII is just one of those points upon which fuller information is necessary, but it would appear that the monarch himself only made two serious political mistakes. They were both in that year 1908, when his judgment was not what it had been : in April, when Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman resigned, instead of returning home to superintend the reconstruction of the Cabinet, he summoned Mr Asquith to Biarritz, and in the following July he refrained from inviting to a garden party at Windsor certain M.Ps. who had adversely criticised his recent visit to the Tsar. In the latter case he eventually gave way, and the invitations were sent, but the King decided not to hold any more garden parties at which he was not permitted to select his guests. For the rest, it may be said that King Edward VII was the perfect model of a constitutional monarch.

It is not, however, round his attitude towards home politics that controversy has raged most fiercely but rather in respect of the line he adopted in foreign affairs, a subject in which he was keenly interested and upon which he held decided views. In this matter there are two schools of thought. In Germany he was—and probably still is—regarded as little better than a fiend in human guise, and Princess Blücher could write from

Berlin after his death : ' Popular hatred here is centred on the shade of King Edward VII ; he is supposed to have been the moving spirit in forming the encirclement of Germany.' In the Reichstag in August 1915, the Imperial Chancellor, Herr von Bethmann-Hollweg, declared : ' King Edward VII believed that his principal task was to isolate Germany. The encirclement by the Entente with openly hostile tendencies was drawn closer year by year. We were compelled to reply to this situation with the Greatest Armament Budget of 1913.' On the other hand, there are those who maintain that even in the formation of the Anglo-French Entente the King played no great part, and that the foreign policy of the reign was in reality wholly conducted by the two Foreign Secretaries, the Marquess of Lansdowne and Sir Edward Grey. The point is no mere academic one, because it concerns British relations with Germany at a critical period of European history, and their record contains more than one lesson for a later generation.

During the long period when he was Prince of Wales there were three influences which much affected the future King's attitude towards international affairs. First of all, there was in his extreme youth the Crimean War, and the close relations which for a time existed between the British Royal Family and Napoleon III ; these had the effect of making him intensely pro-French and anti-Russian. Then there was his marriage to Princess Alexandra of Denmark, which was so soon followed by a German attack upon his wife's country ; from that date the Prince was pronouncedly pro-Danish and anti-Prussian. Lastly there occurred the long Premiership of Lord Palmerston during his most impressionable years : this, in its turn, fixed in him a permanent leaning towards an active foreign policy. As the nineteenth century drew to its close there was also the growth of personal antipathy between him and his nephew Kaiser Wilhelm II. The consequences of this last circumstance have been often exaggerated, but it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the suspicion and dislike with which King Edward was regarded by the Kaiser had some influence upon German policy, and that this in its turn further estranged uncle and nephew until the vicious circle was complete.

Queen Victoria had no more allowed her eldest son to play a part in foreign than in home politics, and although she had herself exercised a fairly strong negative influence over the monarchs of the continent she exercised it from home. She travelled but little, and when she went abroad it was as a private person. Only once during her sixty-three years' reign did she pay an official visit to a foreign country, and that was in 1855 when, with the Prince Consort, she went to Paris. The Prince of Wales acted very differently. He loved the continent; he liked meeting his foreign relatives and their ministers; he revelled in ceremonial; and he was at his best in the midst of the magnificent pageantry which still characterised the Courts of Europe. In addition, the Prince was a first-rate linguist, and a true cosmopolitan who felt himself at home anywhere. He early acquired a clear knowledge of international affairs, together with a shrewd idea where British interests lay; while he managed, without ceasing to be a 'good European,' to advance the cause of his own country. In spite of the obstacles placed in his path by his mother King Edward VII was, at the time of his accession, remarkably well qualified to collaborate with his ministers in the field of international affairs.

The position of Great Britain in 1901 was not what it had been. Lord Salisbury had for many years combined the offices of Prime Minister and Foreign Secretary, but, in the opinion of one of his successors in the latter capacity, he was, by the turn of the century, 'weakly temporising and without initiative to meet the new conditions of a rapidly changing world.' He was still Prime Minister, but had recently been succeeded at the Foreign Office by the Marquess of Lansdowne. The policy of splendid isolation which had been pursued for several decades had, as was proved when disasters came thick during the early weeks of the South African War, left Britain without a friend in Europe, and only her overwhelming naval supremacy had prevented the formation of a coalition against her at that time. With France relations were hardly less strained than they had been during the Fashoda incident, and memories were still fresh of the contest between Mr Joseph Chamberlain and M. Hanotaux. Russia was feared and her intentions suspected, as had

been the case during the greater part of the nineteenth century. Germany, with whom Britain had hitherto been on the best of terms, was showing signs of becoming unfriendly, and the Kaiser's telegram to President Kruger on the morrow of the Jameson Raid had been by no means wholly forgotten. The situation, in short, was far from reassuring.

So much was common ground, but there were differences of opinion as to the remedies to be applied. For some years Mr Joseph Chamberlain, then Colonial Secretary and the foremost member of Lord Salisbury's administration, had been advocating a foreign policy based on the closest collaboration with Germany and the United States, and he had been given a remarkably free hand by the Cabinet to put his ideas into practice, though the old Prime Minister himself was more than a little sceptical about his colleague's chances of success. The first advances of the Colonial Secretary, made in 1898 and the succeeding year, were not well received in Berlin, where, *more Germanico*, they were regarded as proof of British weakness, and Mr Chamberlain sustained a severe rebuff at the hands of the Imperial Chancellor, Prince von Bülow, which caused him to remark to the Kaiser that the German statesman was 'a bad man to go tiger-shooting with.'

In spite of this setback the Cabinet agreed to allow their colleague to try again, so when the Boer armies were in flight, and the General Election of 1900 had returned the Government to power with an unimpaired majority, the Colonial Secretary once more got in touch with Baron von Eckardstein, his friend and intermediary in all negotiations with the Wilhelmstrasse. In the very month that King Edward came to the throne Mr Chamberlain told Eckardstein that the moment had come for Great Britain to abandon her policy of isolation, and to link herself either with the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy, or with Russia and France. In this connection it must be remembered that the revelation of Russian military weakness in the war against Japan still lay ahead, and that these two combinations of Powers were generally regarded as constituting a balance. Mr Chamberlain said that he would himself prefer closer relations with Germany, and that in his opinion a beginning

could best be made by a secret agreement concerning Morocco. If the German Government refused, Great Britain would be obliged to make a treaty with Russia, even at the price of considerable sacrifices in China and on the Persian Gulf.

Accordingly negotiations were resumed, and they dragged on for some six months, though warned by his previous experience, the Colonial Secretary left the principal part in the conduct of them to Lord Lansdowne. That they came to nothing was largely due to that evil genius of the Hohenzollern Reich, Baron von Holstein, who kept instilling into the Kaiser and the Imperial Chancellor the belief that Great Britain had always pursued the policy of getting others to pick her chestnuts out of the fire, and that this was why she wanted an agreement with Germany. He did not believe that there was any possibility of an understanding between London and Paris, and therefore Germany was in a position to sell her friendship at a very high price.

Far from opposing this move on the part of his ministers King Edward did everything that he could to second it. In August he had a long interview with the Kaiser at Wilhelmsöhe ; but the meeting proved a failure, for it left both upon the King and the British Government the impression that, to quote Sir Sidney Lee, ' the Kaiser was insincere in his protestations for an alliance, and that the chauvinist tone of the German press more correctly represented the attitude of Germany.' Meanwhile Mr Chamberlain was becoming increasingly restive, though Prince von Bülow remained deaf to warnings that the Colonial Secretary's attitude was changing. In the summer ' The Times ' openly advocated an understanding with Russia, and called attention to the growing strength of the German Navy. As the months passed an Anglo-German alliance was seen to be a mere dream, and the winter witnessed an exchange of polemics between Mr Chamberlain and the Imperial Chancellor which marked the end of the attempt to arrive at an understanding with Berlin.

Mr Chamberlain had now learned the lesson which was one day in even more tragic circumstances to be forced upon his younger son, namely the impossibility of coming to an understanding with Germany. Every

concession was either regarded as weakness or was used as an excuse for making another demand. King Edward had probably reached this conclusion earlier, but, if so, it made no difference to his efforts to further his Government's policy of friendship with Berlin. This arch-conspirator of encirclement left no stone unturned to come to an arrangement with Germany, and when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was concluded at the end of January 1902, he insisted that the German Government should be informed at once. So much for the legend that King Edward was always working against the Reich. On the contrary, the Franco-British Entente would never have been formed, and Great Britain would have become the ally of Germany, had it not been for the attitude of the Kaiser, the Imperial Chancellor, and, above all, Baron von Holstein.

It would be untrue to say that King Edward initiated, or even played the leading part in, the negotiations with France which then took place, but it is extremely doubtful whether they would have been successful without him. He created the atmosphere in which the statesmen of the two countries were able to collaborate. The turning-point was his visit to Paris in May 1903. As Prince of Wales in the days of his youth he had been a favourite in the French capital, but since then Great Britain and France had more than once been on the verge of war, while French sympathy for the Boers was notorious. The visit to Paris was therefore one of the most critical episodes of the King's life, and as he drove down the Champs Elysées, on his way from the Bois de Boulogne station, the crowd was sullenly respectful, and few were the hats that were doffed; here and there, too, were heard cries of 'Vivent les Boers,' 'Vive Marchand,' and 'Vive Fashoda.' 'The French don't like us,' somebody remarked to the King. 'Why should they?' was the characteristic reply, and before the visit was over the scene was completely changed.

King Edward neglected no opportunity of impressing upon the French his desire to be their friend, and one incident will suffice to illustrate the scrupulous attention which he paid to detail. One evening, accompanied by his suite, he went to the Théâtre Français. The house was full, but the public were icy, so during the interval

the King left his box with the intention of winning this hostile crowd to his side. In the lobby he saw an actress whom he had met in London. Holding out his hand, he said : ' Oh, Mademoiselle, I remember how I applauded you in London. You personified there all the grace, all the *esprit* of France.' Never had King Edward better displayed his ability to say and do the right thing : the remark spread like wildfire, and the ice was broken. The incident, moreover, was typical. In the streets and at official receptions, in public and in private, he exerted all his tremendous powers of charm, with the result that when he left Paris the route was lined with a madly enthusiastic crowd, and where there had been cries of ' Vivent les Boers ' there were now shouts of ' Vive notre Roi.' This visit was surely one of the greatest personal triumphs in recent history.

During the months which elapsed before the Entente was concluded King Edward gave invaluable support to his ministers. The policy they were pursuing was more to his liking, it is true, than that of an agreement with Germany, but, true constitutional monarch that he was, he did as much to further the Government's efforts in the one case as in the other. The King's part in the conclusion of the Franco-British Entente was later well defined by M. Poincaré when he said : " Not one of my fellow-countrymen has forgotten the happy impetus given on that decisive occasion by His Majesty King Edward VII to the work of concord which has outlived him.' The Entente is now a thing of the past, and the future of Anglo-French relations is extremely uncertain, but the agreement for which King Edward laboured brought victory in the Four Years' War, and thus it may be said to have represented one of those instances where the good that men have done is not interred with their bones.

When, in due course, the time came to include Russia in the Entente the King once more did everything in his power to help the Government of the day, and it was an indirect consequence of these efforts that, as already mentioned, he fell foul of certain Radicals and Socialists who objected to any understanding with Russia on what would now be described as ideological grounds. During national friction at the time of the separation of Norway from Denmark, and again when difficulties arose between

Turkey and Greece over the question of Crete. Either or both of these crises might have led to war had they not been properly handled, and it was by his attitude on these and similar occasions that King Edward earned his title of the Peacemaker.

No account, however brief, of the King's life and work would be complete without some reference to his interest in the Empire overseas and in the United States. In his youth he had travelled in all parts of the world, and he was the only English monarch since his namesake, Edward I, to set foot in the East. When he came to the throne he sent the Prince of Wales to represent him at the opening of the first Commonwealth Parliament, and his reception of the Boer generals at the close of the South African War did much to create the atmosphere which rendered possible the subsequent establishment of the Union of South Africa. It was a matter of the deepest regret to him that he was unable to visit Canada for the tercentenary celebrations of the founding of Quebec in 1908, but that particular year was a critical one in Europe, and it behoved the King to remain, if not at home, at any rate within easy reach of home. Towards Ireland he was always sympathetic, and his feelings were cordially reciprocated by his Irish subjects; indeed, had his ministers shared his insight where Ireland was concerned the history of the United Kingdom might have been very different. With regard to India it was the same: his tour of that country in 1875-76 had given him a keen perception of its administration and of the personality of the native princes, and this interest he retained until his death. As for the United States, which the King had visited as Prince of Wales, he was on the friendliest terms with many Americans of both sexes, while Mr Whitelaw Reid was one of his intimates. President Theodore Roosevelt he never saw, but the correspondence between the two men is eloquent of the cordial relations which existed where they were concerned, and the King gave evidence of his feelings towards the United States in his prediction that if Mr Roosevelt would visit England he would 'see what a reception would be given to the President of the United States by the King of Great Britain and Ireland and by his people.'

With the coming of the year 1908 the shadows began

to lengthen, and it became clear that the King's health was breaking down. He had long been troubled with attacks of bronchitis, and now his heart began to be seriously affected. He became subject to despondency and melancholy, and, ignoring the results of his own life's work, in one of these fits of depression he made the gloomy prophecy, 'My son may reign, but my grandson never will.' At home the situation soon became tense with the rejection of the Budget by the House of Lords and with increasing social unrest, while abroad the King never forgave the Emperor Francis Joseph for the deception which he considered had been practised upon him in the matter of the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In fact the reign closed amid the gathering clouds that heralded a storm of which the violence is still far from spent. It was the end of an era both for Britain and for the world, but we now know that when King Edward VII died he had ensured not only that the British monarchy should ride the whirlwind but that his country should not face the German peril alone. These are the claims to immortality of the King who spoke his own epitaph when he said '*Mon métier à moi est d'être roi.*'

CHARLES PETRIE.

Art. 3.—FRENCH MILITARY TRAINING FOR DEFEAT.

A SHORT time before this war I represented the British Army at the annual course at Versailles arranged by the French High Command to train and practise their commanders.

More than a year has now elapsed since Germany astounded the whole world by utterly defeating France in a whirlwind campaign of only a few weeks' duration. At the time it was a feat of arms which neither the man in the street nor the professional soldier contemplated as being possible or probable. Many reasons and excuses have been put forward to account for the amazing downfall of the French Armies. They can be summarised in general as follows :

The psychological effect on officers and men of the comparative inaction involved in waiting for eight months before the battle began, a period of inaction which would probably have a more adverse effect on the minds and character of the French nation than of any other ; political, Quisling, and fifth-column influences, strengthened and intensified with no active operations or successes to intervene ; the weakness of the hinge of the advance, which if broken would allow the Germans to strip the hard rind of the fighting troops from the indispensable core of command, supply, and reserve ; the breaking of all rearward communications by the attacks of the Panzer divisions and dive-bombers ; jealousy between commanders ; the fact that the French Armies were neither organised nor equipped for modern mechanised mobile warfare.

My experiences at Versailles may assist in throwing new light on the causes of this downfall. They show that the weakness of the French Army was more fundamental and deep-rooted than was supposed. The course lasted for one month, giving reasonable time for the study at first hand of French methods, strategy and tactics, the future leaders of their Army, and the views of their High Command as to the manner in which they considered the next war would be fought.

The students consisted of thirty-two French officers, varying in rank from divisional commanders to colonels, all earmarked for promotion. They were drawn from

cavalry, artillery, engineers, and infantry, but there was no representative from the tank corps. The other foreign representatives were from the Bulgarian, Roumanian, and Swiss Armies. I became great friends with the Bulgarian, who was a first-class soldier. He was no admirer of the French Army, and as the course progressed became more and more outspoken in his opinions of the cautious and old-fashioned nature of the French methods for the future war. On the other hand, he was a fervent admirer of the British. He could not understand our friendship for France. If only, as he said, Great Britain and Germany could arrive at some understanding the combination would be so strong that the possibilities of war would be eliminated for all time. The Roumanian was much too busy sampling the delights of Montmartre and Montparnasse to waste his time on his profession and was universally disliked by the rest of the course. The Swiss was a very earnest and hardworking officer. He gave me their official history of the Great War to read, which runs into many volumes, and clearly shows that they won the war. Twice, by mobilising, they prevented the Germans from invading France through Switzerland, and long lists were included of the gallant Swiss who had lost their lives in the defence of their country—from typhoid, influenza, fever, and other ailments. But this is a digression.

At that time the French High Command was convinced that the next war was imminent, and that it would be against Germany, whose strength was frequently heard to be estimated as nearing three hundred divisions. Throughout the course the fact that the enemy were tacitly assumed to be the Germans was very marked. The 'enemy Blue force' in the various exercises was often referred to in conversation as 'les Allemands' or 'les Boches.' They did not consider that they had any other nation to fear, so that the task of the Army was simplified.

The greatest trouble had obviously been taken in the preparation of the exercises and in their solutions. The hours were long and the atmosphere intensely practical. Unlike the many paper exercises to which the British officer was accustomed, only troops, staffs, armaments, and equipment which were actually in existence in the Army were dealt with. The basis of the whole month's

work was founded on the holding up of a large German turning movement, which had overwhelmed Northern France, had crossed the river Seine, and was actually seriously threatening Paris from the west. Time had to be gained for the movement round Paris of the reserve formations, and this it was estimated would take six days. Except for a counter-attack, on which a few days' study was expended, the whole of the month was devoted to the defence.

The psychological effect on the French commanders, in this most important month of their training for war, of the continual study of all forms of the defensive against their hereditary enemy, who had already presumably broken through the French defensive system and penetrated so far into the country as to endanger their capital, might well engender in their subconscious minds a feeling of defeatism before ever the war started.

Now let us deal with the equipment of the French Army, and the manner in which their commanders were taught that it should be used. They were intelligent soldiers, and they knew all about the German Panzer divisions and their method of employment. Some, such as General de Gaulle, had been outspoken in urging that similar divisions should be formed to replace at least a part of the cumbersome masses of the French Army. However, we were taught that tanks were to be regarded in the light of armoured infantry, certainly of great assistance in the battle if they should happen to be available.

The Commander-in-Chief, General Gamelin, had laid down that 'under no circumstances whatever can tanks replace the artillery fire normally required to support an infantry operation.' Independent action by tanks must be confined to rigidly defined areas. The Chief-of-the-Staff, General Georges, whom many considered to be the leading soldier of France, stated in a speech which he made to us that he wished it to be clearly understood that in the opinion of the French War Council no new method of warfare had been evolved since the termination of the Great War. He added that this subject was being most carefully watched, and the Army could rest assured that they would be informed immediately any alterations in the present methods were considered to be advisable. He also endorsed General Gamelin's views that the artillery

was paramount on the battlefield and that the employment of tanks must always be considered as supplementary to the artillery barrage.

I had many a discussion and argument with the French officers on this subject. Their opinion in general was that this doctrine was forced upon them, since the French Army possessed so few tanks, and most of these, such as the Renault, were antiquated and quite out of date, some having actually seen service in the last war. Few of them agreed with it. One distinguished French general remarked to me that France had spent so much money on the Maginot Line that she could not afford to spend any more on tanks: 'they cost so many francs, so we have to be content with anti-tank guns and rifles which are so much cheaper.'

I often heard it stated that the Army had been starved of equipment to make the Maginot Line. The great majority of French commanders would have preferred to have the modern equipment, and expressed their apprehension of what might happen if by any chance the Maginot Line was turned and it became necessary for them to fight the Germans in the open. During one of the few days allotted to the study of the offensive and the attack, the lack of modern equipment was exemplified. The Army with which we were operating possessed several battalions of old-fashioned tanks, which looked neither bullet proof nor even weather proof. We were also the proud possessors of a battalion of the very latest and extremely efficient cruiser type of tanks. A crisis arose in which I strongly advocated that this battalion should be employed. The French Directing Staff were aghast: 'but you cannot use these,' they said, 'it is the only battalion in all France.'

Here was another fundamental weakness in the psychology of the French commander, the brooding feeling that he would be required to fight with weapons and equipment which he knew to be antiquated and quite unfit for modern war, and with doctrines and methods with which he did not agree. Their outlook as to the support their Air Force could give them was even worse. The High Command gave no inkling that the air could assist in battle, beyond observation, reconnaissance, and the bombing of communications, and there seemed to be

a lack of cooperation between their land and air forces. Private conversation elicited the fact that the French Army had not much faith in their Air Force ; that it was not the fault of the air personnel, since it was purely a question of money which was lacking for their development.

Let us consider the conditions under which the French commanders were taught that they could attack. It must be realised that they were expected to circulate these doctrines throughout their commands. They put all their faith in the value of artillery support, in which they manifested the greatest confidence. But it was ruled by the High Command that eight days were required before the necessary ammunition could be concentrated, and therefore before that period had elapsed no serious attack could be contemplated. The methods of the employment of their tanks have already been discussed.

The lessons and experience of the last Great War could not have been well learned, and during the twenty years which had elapsed military thought should surely have advanced in company with science and new inventions. If that war had lasted into 1919 the Allies contemplated an attack with an armoured force of over five thousand tanks, while if the Germans had possessed a comparable number of tanks in 1918 they would have come very close to winning the war.

In all the problems put forward for solution it was apparent that the French had determined to treat war as a mathematical proposition, and that they considered that modern war and modern armaments left little scope for the initiative of the individual. The High Command laid down the most stringent rules for frontages, numbers, weight of artillery fire, timings, etc., in all phases of war. Any divergence from these was frowned upon. For the purposes of paper schemes, this certainly simplified their solution. The French commanders attending the course thought that these were natural and essential. They were the rules evolved for the guidance of a National Army, which must be prepared to mobilise and to fight at very short notice. They were for the benefit of the mass of the Army, who had undergone the minimum of training to suit the politics and purse of the French nation. It was preferable to instil a good method into the mind of the

Army than to allow a partially trained soldier to work on his own initiative. The insistence on rigid adherence to rules, that no relaxation from them is permitted, and that any divergence will have an adverse effect on his career, must have a bad influence on the fighting capabilities of a commander or staff officer if faced by a situation for which no rules have been evolved.

The mind of the ambitious French officer was wrapped up in his profession. His consuming ambition was promotion, which would bring him higher pay and a higher social position. This course, when he was being tested for high command, might be the turning-point of his career. No great harm could come to him if he slavishly followed the rules as enunciated by his superiors. The one abject object of the majority was to give the school solution as their answers to the problems. The remark was often heard: 'What do the Directing Staff want us to say?' The exceptions to this were the cavalry commanders. Their broader outlook on life, and possibly their independent means, allowed them to take a more independent and personal view.

It became increasingly obvious that the feelings of the officers on the course towards the Directing Staff were by no means all that could be desired. The officers were nearly all commanders with many rows of medals, great fighting experience of the last war, and with strong opinions of their own, to which they did not dare give voice in view of the very dogmatic doctrines propounded by the Directing Staff. Towards the end of the course the 'students' gave their customary party to the officers of the Directing Staff, but only one was invited besides the Commandant. The opening speech was made by a French general, who, to their great delight, ridiculed the somewhat pedagogic solutions to their work; I found out afterwards that he was on the retired list, so I suppose considered that as he had little chance of further promotion he could say what he liked. Under the influence of many glasses of sweet champagne I replied a little more tactfully but in the same vein, and received vociferous applause.

But no Army can function at its best unless there is absolute trust and good feeling between commanders and staff. As regards the French officers as a whole, I found

them very earnest, and knowledgeable in their profession. They were very pleasant to meet, had a great respect for rank, but from the British point of view were almost too punctilious. I found that I was expected to salute and shake hands with each one of the officers of my syndicate four times a day—when we met in the morning, when I went off to lunch, when I returned from lunch, and when we finished work in the evening. According to our standards they were very underpaid, and seemed to have few outside contacts. I found the possibilities of social life between us to be difficult, as their life appeared to consist of working, eating, and visiting their lady friends, in none of which occupations and pastimes was a male companion required. Not one of them could speak a word of English.

They could never understand how such a great and rich Empire as ours could only produce such a tiny army, and that so ill equipped for war. I found their questions on this subject very difficult to answer: They had spent so much money on their forces, why didn't we; were we not allies with a common cause and facing the same danger; had not we said that our frontiers were on the Rhine, and yet it was obvious that we could not send out more than a token force; why didn't we have conscription, we were hiding behind French bayonets.

In their schemes the British Army was considered as making barely any appreciable increase to the forces for the defence of France, at any rate for the all-important opening phases of the war. Distrust in your ally may well produce the germ of defeatism, which may break out into a disease. When the war started this became a subject of continuous propaganda on the part of the Germans.

I suggest, as the result of my experience at the foremost school of French military teaching, that the failure of the French Army was not so much through the brilliance of the German Army, and its equipment and methods, as through the failure in the fundamental psychology of the French commanders and their staffs. They were possessed by a growing and understandable discontent that their great ally was apparently doing so little to prepare with them for the coming war. They had been taught that the modern equipment which their hearts desired was lacking, since so much money had been spent

on the Maginot Line. If the Maginot Line was turned or broken they feared the worst. The defensive was ingrained in them. The Germans had three hundred divisions, so only defence was possible. The attack was a ponderous affair and could only take place if the enemy were considerate enough to stay quiet for a week—and where would the Panzer divisions have reached in that time with all France in which to manœuvre. Initiative would not be required of them. Rules had been carefully evolved for their guidance, and these must be adhered to or their future careers would be endangered. Presumably these would cover all the situations of war in which they might find themselves. With a nation in arms and five million men in the field they would never have to think for themselves.

In the Battle of France the French commanders were compelled to fight in situations for which their peace-time training gave no answer. A hole was made in the French defensive system and German armoured forces started to pass through. There were only two ways of stopping such a leak: to isolate the area of the leak by a new defensive system in accordance with their teaching at Versailles, using reserves which must be available and able to move in sufficient time to their allotted positions; or to stop the hole by quick counter-attack with forces at least comparable in fighting power to those of the enemy—but for this the French armoured forces were neither comparable nor immediately available.

With incredible rapidity the leak became a river, and German Panzer divisions and mechanised forces poured through in ever-increasing volume; this called for speed, quick thinking, self-confidence, and personal initiative in all down to the humblest commander, every man imbued with a winning complex and trained for victory. The river became a flood, spreading over an area far too big to allow the French reserves, already stretched to breaking-point, to reform an effective defensive system. They had never been taught to stand and fight irrespective of danger to their flanks, using their own initiative. They had been trained to fight in mass, with divisions on the right and divisions on the left, and that terrible and most contagious of military diseases known as 'flank fear' spread through their ranks. Though they were brought

up in the teaching of the defensive they were never given any intimation at Versailles that any defence should be considered except in the forward zone. Pitiful obstacles—carts, tables, barrels, pianos—were hastily put up by individual commanders to hold the entrances to towns and villages, which could not even impede the German advance. They were no different to those their fathers had erected in 1914, their grandfathers in 1870, and their great-grandfathers in 1815. Even for Paris no serious and concrete plan of defence seemed to have been evolved, much less put into practice. In our peace-time schemes at Versailles there was plenty of time, six days were allowed, to move the French reserves round Paris to meet the menace of the German advance, so surely there should be plenty of time to mount a defence if ever the improbable happened that Paris itself was in danger.

Only attack could now save France, and there was no time to mount an attack such as their peace-time training envisaged. To add to their difficulties the roads were blocked by the fleeing population, railway communications were destroyed, and troops and munitions could only pass with great delay. Time, as always, was an all-important factor in the Battle of France, but German training and German equipment had reduced time as visualised by the French commanders from weeks and days to hours and minutes. The Germans had perfected a battle technique against which the French commanders could not adapt their previous training and methods. Brains and minds brought up in fixed grooves could never adjust themselves to such unaccustomed and ever-changing problems. They had been trained for defeat and not for victory.

The course ended with a luncheon party given by the French War Council to the foreign representatives at the new Army Club in Paris, which was also attended by the various foreign attachés of their countries. As the senior of the foreign representatives I had to reply to the toast of our health. Later I asked the Bulgarian representative what he thought of my speech; he replied: 'It was magnificent; of course, your French was far from good, but it was the voice of Great Britain speaking—I have telephoned every word of it to our headquarters in Sofia.'

How differently we looked upon these things in

England. I was given no guidance as to what I was to say, and I don't suppose that anybody at home took the slightest interest in my speech to the Armies of four nations. Perhaps it was the principle of teaching the British officer to use his own initiative. On my return to England, I forwarded a voluminous report dealing with all aspects of French military thought, presumably of vital interest to us. Nearly four months elapsed before I received a note to the effect that my report had 'just' been read, was of considerable interest, and thanking me for my trouble.

What are the lessons which we can learn for the guidance of the British Army? Proud and great nations have been defeated in battle, and we also have suffered reverses. Our Armies as a whole are not yet fully equipped for modern war, but our soldiers must know that this is not due to lack of money or to the will to provide. Our enemies are well equipped, but they have many years' start of us. A vast amount of equipment was lost in France, Norway, and Greece. It takes time to train the craftsmen and to build the factories to make the tools, and to train the craftsmen and to build the factories to employ those tools to make the equipment. It takes time to produce the equipment in the colossal quantity which our Armies require for the defeat of the Nazis. Our soldiers can rest assured that, when they win the ultimate victory over the German Army, it will be with the help of the best and most offensive weapons and equipment which experience, science, and industry can provide.

The chief lesson to be learnt from this war is that it is the number of the factories, the skill and the labour of the mechanics, and the precision of the tools which must be so great a factor in the winning of a war. Large armies ill equipped are useless and will always be defeated by the small army which is well equipped. Until they can be properly equipped, all men with the necessary knowledge should be in the factories. It is the battle of production which must be won before the forces of a nation can claim their victory. As General de Gaulle pleaded in vain, it is machines and not only men who are required, machines on the ground and machines in the air.

Are the stringent rules and regulations as laid down

for the French Army advisable for our own? Our Staff College and military schools may have aimed at turning out officers with the same thought in order, as it is often said, that they should speak the same language in war. This is certainly necessary and desirable. But the wider and imperial outlook of the British officer will allow him to treat rules and regulations as a guide and to adapt them to meet the local situation.

Fortunately for us, in the years preceding this war, some of our best commanders have consistently preached the value of personal initiative, particularly in dealing with the unforeseen situation. The foremost among these was General Sir Archibald Wavell, whom the Germans now name as 'a very, very good commander,' and General Sir Maitland Wilson, both experts at teaching the orthodox way of dealing with the unorthodox. General Cecil Heywood, who unfortunately died while commanding a division before he could see the effects of his teaching bear fruit in war, and General Sir John Kennedy, who commanded our 1st Division shortly before the war and now organises our Red Cross. All experienced and brilliant soldiers, to train with whom was a tonic which kept the mind alert and prevented all staleness. They breathed speed, quick thinking, and personal initiative.

The feeling of the French commander towards his Higher Staff did not make for a happy Army, at any rate in peace-time. That should never happen in our Army, where at the worst the staff officer is looked upon as a necessary nuisance. The French Armies had to undergo a period of waiting and of battle-inaction; so must our own. The French Armies were brought up on the defensive; the Armies of Great Britain are also on the defensive, the defence of the homeland. We also have our Maginot Line—the English Channel and the sea—but our soldiers will welcome the day when the German Armies attempt to cross it. There is no fear of the canker of defence which permeated the minds of the French commanders, and was passed on by them to their troops.

Political influences do not affect our soldiers. They trust their leaders, both military and civilian, and know that all are imbued with the one idea, without any thought of personal gain or ambition—to win the war. We have no allies whom we distrust, and have implicit

faith in the power of our great Empire and in the ultimate victory of the English-speaking races.

The day will certainly come when the British Armies will sally forth from the fortress of Great Britain to give battle to the Germans on their own soil. It is for this that our training and equipment must be designed. Throughout this trying period of inaction the spirit of the offensive is and must be ingrained in the training of our Armies at home.

E. D. H. TOLLEMACHE.

Art. 4.—THE WORK AND FUTURE OF THE CITY CHURCHES.

EIGHTY years ago Dickens wrote in 'The Uncommercial Traveller' of the City churches :

'The wonder is that at the heart of the world's metropolis there should be these resting places unknown to far greater numbers of people speaking the English tongue than the ancient edifices of Rome or the Pyramids of Egypt. They have outlived the Plague and the Fire, too, to die a slow death in these later days.'

Like the sovereign who saw them outlive the Plague, they have been a most unconscionable time dying.

The Fire had destroyed or badly damaged 86 out of 107, and of these 51 were rebuilt. The Union of Benefices Act of 1871 thinned them out. In 1919 the fires of controversy began to play around 19 of the 51 then in all remaining, clerical finance, with a glorious confusion of capital and revenue issues, seeing in their site values a gold mine for relieving the current generation of sundry financial burdens. The Union of Benefices and Disposal of Churches (Metropolis) Measure was passed by the National Assembly of the Church of England and laid before both Houses of Parliament. It was rejected by the Lower House on Nov. 25, 1926, by 124 votes to 27, amid general relief, and a feeling that once again the reputedly a-Christian House of Commons had shown itself more closely in touch with sincere opinion in the country, and a better judge of what was ultimately sound and in the best interests of Church and nation, than the religious themselves.

To-day the adversity wreaked by the fury of the aggressor has made strange bedfellows. Hitler has done overnight what has long given piquancy to the dreams of churchmen. Many of the churches have shared the fate of the surrounding property, and stand pitiful shells or heaps of rubble awaiting clearance. The survivors bear battle scars, and live but from day to day. The sites are clear, or as good as clear. Market values, perhaps, are not as steady as in the times that were. Collateral requirements, on the other hand, will make demands on the Church which the most generous Government aid can hardly be expected to meet. There will be consider-

able fluidity of finance, and schemes will not be far to seek. What are the chances of the City churches outliving the Second and more terrible Fire ?

As churchmen do not always appreciate, we are a national Church, enjoying the sympathy, often curiously disguised, of a wider entity than our own body, to whom in turn we owe duties and service. Few, for example, will now be found to contest the extreme unwisdom, despite the apparently clear-cut issue on sectarian grounds, of the attempt made in 1871 to get a faculty for the demolition of St Ethelburga's, that gem of a mediæval, tiny parish church beneath the soaring office blocks of Bishopsgate. Quite apart from its religious and cultural service to a liberal cross-section of society these past forty years, the witness of its fabric to the roots of our island history could have ill been spared by the nation at large.

So many kinds of people will be interested in the rebuilding of London, and are, indeed, represented on the Commission which the present Bishop has set up under the chairmanship of Lord Merriman. Representatives of architecture and of civic life are there co-responsible with divines. The former will, no doubt, examine with especial sympathy the view put forward by Mr Henry Lamb in a letter to 'The Times' dated January 9 of this year, in which he advocated the perpetuation of Wren's effect of 'a sort of constellation or planetary system dominated and maintained by St Paul's. . . . The wonderful effect of its partial survival—even struggling against the encroaching monuments of modern progress—can have escaped few. . . .' After arguing the practicability of such reconstruction, he concluded :

'In view, then, of the wholesale replanning that must be done in some districts after the war, will it not be a fortunate occasion to restore not only as many of these churches as possible, but also, by removing some of the commercial and other premises that have been allowed to grow up too close around them, to disengage and so restore the collective idea of the whole series ?'

Now, granted that the ecclesiastical architecture in the City, as a group and in detail, constituted the most satisfying example of Wren's work and memorial to his

genius, architects might well be disposed to look favourably upon such a scheme. But they, with all due deference, exist to translate into technical specifications and potentially artistic masterpieces the needs of others. They do not build in a vacuum. The special needs they are and will increasingly be called upon to interpret are the concern of the nation at large, and in due measure of the Church in particular. Is there a basis of practical use and need for this vision of restoration? It is the conviction of the present writer that there is.

Dickens, beneath his prophetic mantle, went on as follows :

‘ No one can be sure of the coming time ; but it is not too much to say of it that it has no sign in its outsetting tides of the reflux to these Churches of their congregations and uses. They remain, like the tombs of the old citizens who lie beneath and around them, monuments of another age. They are worth a Sunday exploration now and then, for they echo not unharmoniously the time when the City of London really was London.’

It has been the mistake of many lesser men than he not to perceive that the more London changes the more it remains, in the City above all, the same thing.

Change it certainly does. While the square mile remains scrupulously constant, intensively it has grown beyond all recognition. The old merchants’ palaces, with their ample gardens and pleasaunces, are no more. The present generation saw the complete extinction of merchants dwelling and begetting successors above their place of business, and had lived to see blocks of residential flats rise in Charterhouse Square and St Paul’s Churchyard, in an attempt to catch the comparative and welcome quiet of the City at night and during week-ends. Private firms are going the way of masters and apprentices, and are daily giving ground to joint stock corporations. The guilds, or livery companies, survive, and handsomely justify their existence by mostly extraneous work. Employers and employed have moved out, to more and more distant villas. At first sight the City now presents a vastly different community from that leisurely cobbled town, ringed with meadows, priest-ridden, wherein

Becket's biographer, FitzStephen, under the second Henry, counted 13 churches attached to convents and 126 parochial ones. The mottoes of the livery companies without exception attest the theocentric view of the world which pertained in those days of craftsmanship and shopkeeping.

By the time the mediæval world sank into the flames of 1666, successive waves of reform and counter-reform had moved the focus of men's thoughts from heaven to earth; yet only to raise them again, to sacramental conceptions of living. So the genius of Wren, baulked of island sites by the demands of property and private enterprise, floated his dome over all, and studded the skyline with an infinite variety of steeples, towers, and lanterns, expressly, in Sir John Squire's words :

' That the generations of men might meet
Mute reminders in every street
That the reign of commerce is not complete.'

In the twentieth century the reign of commerce—if by commerce one means Mammon, and by Mammon the antithesis to personal and social righteousness and the essential values of the Kingdom of Heaven—is far from complete. Men go to the City to make money, or they did before the war. But there is no place where money is worshipped less or less treated as an end in itself. The bulk of reputable business is conducted at a high level of integrity, according to a code which, although it is not that of the Sermon on the Mount, is high—a Christian survival, yet not so far removed from its parent stem—rigidly adhered to, and often with a full appreciation of obligations to society wider than the immediate interests of the trader or his class. It is indeed difficult to avoid the suspicion that it is this essential soundness of character in the vast majority of City men which has contributed more than anything else to London's prosperity through the ages, and made it, and kept it (despite a temporary evacuation to America after the last war) the financial centre of the world.

Surely the churches are as much in place to-day as ever they were. Currencies in religion and in economic life and organisation may have changed, but the difference is not one of quality. Life would be a poorer thing

for all in the City (perhaps for others too in surprisingly distant parts of the world), trading less satisfying, restraints against quick and opportunist gains less potent, tolerance more difficult, without the outward and visible sign of the churches. It is inconceivable that in view of its traditional, organic background the City of London would tolerate a reconstruction which denied it, call it the luxury if you will, of a full complement of churches.

The proposal has been made that in the interests of economy towers could be left or re-built, and the nave sites disposed of at a profit. It is always dangerous trying to combine worship with doing things on the cheap. Former, and in some ways more crudely religious, ages have always earned our deepest gratitude when they let themselves go. The experiment has already been tried at various points in the City, always with the same results. The towers have quickly assumed a derelict, forlorn look, as if protesting against their conversion into cenotaphs of a once vital religion, and proclaim far more eloquently the half-heartedness of the demolisher than the glory of an eternal God. A further array of towers, unattached, and dwarfed by the already brutal dimensions of many commercial blocks, would succeed only in perpetuating the ineffectual hold on religion of a materialist and profit-taking generation. A church tower is not an entity, like an obelisk : and in this country even obelisks have a habit of not coming off. Cleopatra's Needle always looks an alien, wistfully inquiring for its native sun. The Duke of York's column to most people commemorates only the Unknown Duke of York, and obelisks seem most congenially indicative as Some-one's Folly. No, a church tower exists to call attention to a church, and the church as a spiritual power-house, generating lofty and ennobling impulses in the hearts of men and women. Let both stand or fall together.

But is there enough work for anything like the number of churches that there were ? Judged by the traditional methods of computing parochial needs and populations, of course, the question is not worth asking. The fact is that the parochial system, the basis and strength of the Church of England since the days of Archbishop Theodore,

and to many minds her best and most enduring hope for the future, stands in need of a fresh approach. It was based on the assumption that where a man slept, there he lived, worked, most likely propagated his species, and died. It presupposed, further, a low standard of general culture, and not too good communications with the outside world. For the average citizen, it was his parish church—or nothing; and for baptisms, marriages, and deaths it could hardly in those days be nothing. Under those conditions Sydney Smith's 'one gentleman in every parish' made a good *point-d'appui* for the nation's spiritual health and progress.

To-day the spread of education, the dissemination of news and views by press and wireless, above all the phenomenal improvements in transport, have fused parish boundaries in what was the heart of the country, let alone London. Comparatively few Londoners work where they sleep. In the City, under normal conditions, five to six hundred thousand spend their day there, and not more than one or two per cent. stay for the night.

Where is the spiritual home of the day-workers? In the parish in which they may for the moment be domiciled, says the legalist, more in precision than hope, knowing that most of them are not acquainted with the imaginary lines of parish boundaries traversing the dreary monotonous suburban landscape. Meanwhile the majority of those who are sufficiently interested to find out get to know of some other church, in atmosphere, perhaps in personnel, more to their general liking, and, thanks to the good offices of the Transport Board, can probably get there in less time than it took their grandparents to approach the parish church of their own day. Most urban congregations, and many country ones, are tending to become eclectic. Few City workers, in any case, avoid changing houses or flats, and parishes, several times in the course of their business lives, and seek in vain that sense of continuity and of the eternal which clings to the associations of a parish church. Instead, they find themselves being swept on helplessly in the flood of change and the general speeding up which has so overwhelmed old habits of church-going and attachment to churches, whether on Sundays or weekdays.

Few churches can have been more susceptible to

198 WORK AND FUTURE OF THE CITY CHURCHES

passing fashions than those in the City. In the *New View of London*, published in 1708, the pre-Reformation traditions of worship were being well maintained in the frequency and regularity of services. There were mattins and evensong each Sunday in every church, often with an additional 'lecture' subsidised maybe by a livery company. And at most churches there were weekday services and lectures as well, often every day. Congregations must perforce often have been small, but the *opus Dei* and the consolation of man continued. The exodus to the suburbs in the nineteenth century gave the City churches a more restful air than was desirable on Sundays, and the contemporaneous one-day-a-week conception of religion caused the dust to settle all through the week. Thus fell the blight recorded by Dickens. Meanwhile, despite efforts to perpetuate it by much recent patronage, which has seen fit to appoint as to sinecures those whom Bishop Westcott referred to as 'worn-out labourers,' a general resurrection among the City churches in the last quarter of a century has attested a wholly different temper in public thought and practice.

A concrete illustration may suffice, drawn from the service registers of one. Apart from a curious burst of vigour—such is the playful irony of Providence—shortly after the selection of the church for demolition under the Phillimore scheme in 1919, it shows a volume of effective activity such as has been experienced, in their differing ways, in practically all the City churches during the same period.

ATTENDANCES AT SERVICES AT ST MICHAEL'S CHURCH, CORNHILL.

1915	18,200	1923	27,500	1933	17,100
1916	17,000	1924	25,900	1934	16,700
1917	20,400	1925	25,800	1935	17,700
1918	20,400	1926	26,900	1936	19,900
		1927	26,400	1937	18,000
		1928	21,900	1938	18,500
1919	20,000	1929	21,100		
1920	21,900	1930	18,700		
1921	31,500	1931	19,700	1939	13,300
1922	27,200	1932	18,200	1940	6,800

Average, per annum, 1919-1938, 22,000

These figures, necessarily only approximate, were collected service by service in good faith, and reckoned on a constant basis throughout the period. The tremendous drop in the last two years reflects, of course, the totally abnormal conditions under which life has gone on in the City during wartime. What with the wholesale evacuation of firms to the country, the calling up of men, the early closing of the Banks, the Stock Exchange, and business houses and the consequent abbreviation of the 'lunch-hour' (one of the most congenial times for church work in the City), and the hours and hours spent, and frankly wasted, rather amusingly as it seems now, in basement shelters during the autumn of the day air-raid warnings, the drop is in no way discreditable, and does not point to any falling off in potential.

As a whole, the figures, drawn from a parish whose dormitory population has probably declined since it was given in Crockford as 157, will serve at least to indicate the need for fresh criteria. The particular church cannot be claimed as exactly typical of the 50, for the simple reason that they are all, potentially at least, intensely individual. It has its own specific functions and dedicated tasks—and thus far, as in the volume of service it is enabled to render to the day population of London, reflects the conditions under which work is conducted practically anywhere in the City, and in a measure the opportunities awaiting every church, and frequently embraced.

To begin with, there are those countless thousands, wholly outside any Register of Services, who come inside to pray, to meditate, to sit, or maybe just negatively to get away for a few moments from the noise and racket of the hustling streets. It is the traditional reproach of the Church of England, a legacy from former days of once-a-week religion, that its churches are rarely entered outside service hours, except by sightseers, and that these are lucky if they find the building unlocked; that people don't drop in to say their prayers, as do our co-religionists abroad. Such an accusation is gloriously untrue all over the City. Men and women do in fact come in and sit or kneel and say their prayers, without a trace of self-consciousness: people of all kinds and classes, from

financial men with silk hats to girl stenographers with no hats at all. There are, of course, local variations. Some churches, near main line termini, are especially useful in the early morning, between the arrival of the cheap 'workmen' tickets and the opening of the offices. Most are visited by a steady trickling stream between, say, 12 and 2.30. Sometimes it is the deep pools of silence that offer the most welcome refreshment. People engaged in the rush and bustle of the busy day, and who often live in flats and restaurants and the blare of someone else's wireless set, may want neither pealing organs nor pleading preachers, not even perhaps the mediation of a liturgical service. They may wish only to drink in the quietude, to spread themselves in the sense of eternity. Even the church which had nothing on was not without its grateful public.

The provision of set services on weekdays, such as have lately been generally prevalent, is a reversion to eighteenth century practice, and earlier, and a happy warning against trying to stereotype and cut down provisions for worship to the needs, real or supposed, of the passing moment. Religion has now, in Lord Brougham's phrase, been allowed to invade the sanctity of private life, to overflow from Sunday worship into the other six days of the week; especially as, with the recent quickening of the tempo of living, the week-end habit has seriously altered methods of Sunday observance. The 'twicers' and 'thricers' who from varying motives swelled Victorian congregations are a sadly dwindling race. Maybe those days will return, maybe not. In the meantime, what is of vital importance is that the instinct to worship is still vital and healthy, as strong as ever. People are still willing and wishful to come to services, whether regular services week by week, or regularly irregular, on weekdays. One thing about the busy day in London is that it is seldom so busy as to preclude time for many other things than strict business.

The service must, however, be of a congenial weight; and among half-a-million citizens, and those British, one must expect to find varying requirements. And it must be immediately available. It would be unreasonable to expect workers, amid their work, to make a long journey.

And in practice in the past, the City, while being wholly non-parochial according to accepted standards, has been more narrowly parochial than the tiniest village. Different closely packed areas are often given over to one trade or interest, with its own colour and associations. These beats are intensely small. Even Cornhill and Lombard Street, which converge after starting a hundred yards apart, and are both mainly financial, are poles asunder: the churches lying between the two have their respective spheres and most distinct connections.

So it comes that each church of the 50 has been able to offer its individual contribution. Usually there is a link, centuries old, with one or more of the Livery Companies. Often there are connections, newly forged, with neighbouring trades, or with business corporations, whose headquarters may be in or near the parish boundaries, and who reinforce a general friendliness with annual and other corporate services. Often the church has taken a distinctive line, whether from the exigencies of geography or from the vigour of its incumbent, or both, and has served the peculiar needs of its surroundings, as well as of a cross-section of the wider public. Sometimes this line has been a shade distinctive and individualist, even for the Established Church; but even this is but a defect of a quality, for it is just this wealth of diversity, this capacity for assimilating in one church such different strains, that constitutes at once the strength and the peculiar administrative difficulties of the Church of England. But in any case, where objections would be valid, were the church that of a lonely moorland parish, in the concentration of City life it is more than tolerable, and offers perhaps one of the rapidly dwindling number of spheres for individuality in the English priesthood.

After the settling down which followed the rejection of the last proposals for the wholesale destruction of City churches, most reformers would have been content to leave the major plunder of the fabrics and concentrate on the lesser prey of the livings, efforts which, in view of comparatively recent and deliberate appointments of pensioners, of the salubrious air of the City, and in a very small minority of cases, the even more salubrious air of distant suburbs, might not have appeared unreasonable.

The carcase would, of course, have been comparatively small. It could not be held to include the sum of more than 100,000*l.* a year which already passes willy-nilly from City endowments to Church work outside its walls, money which would often pass even more willingly were there more control in its use vested in the source. All that is left is the income of the livings, which in the past have averaged about 750*l.* a year, usually without a house: a computation inclusive of the stipends paid to four suffragan bishops, which, although considerably swelling the average, would presumably remain clear of any financial rearrangement. The emoluments of City rectories are in fact generally on a par with so-called golden canonries elsewhere. Affluent indeed in the dim and distant past, they have been so pruned and hacked at by successive Commissions and Acts of Parliament that little survives beyond the *magni nominis umbra* and the odium attaching to traditional inequalities.

The amount available for future depredations is not considerable. But much more important is the work, both for its own sake and in its relation to the clergy. For many years now the greatest weakness of the Church has not been the paucity of churches nor the diminishing number of ordinands, but the quality of the clergy. For centuries the Church attracted, through varying motives, some worthy, some less worthy, the best brains and characters, or its fair share of them. The rewards were often dazzling: pomp and power in Church and State; the glittering wealth of pluralities; leisure and opportunity for lives of study and studious devotion, and thereby the maintenance of the centuries-old reputation of the Church for scholarship, '*Clerus Anglicanus stupor mundi.*' True, there were not enough prizes to go round; there may, in fact, have been very few. So Sydney Smith declared, and on the whole commended the system of lottery, whereby a few prizes and many blanks produced a good field. For most of the blanks were really prizes; even the losers were all assured of a life-work worth doing for its own sake, and the chance of doing it in their own way—which when it comes to the bedrock is all that many good men ask of life in every age. The Church offered a vocation and independence, thereby attracting men of

culture and ability and good will, who were often in a position to eke out the emoluments of the parson's freehold with private means.

The Church was thus spared the financial burdens of newer professions—the civil service, education, medicine. It had no need to evolve a competitive scale of emoluments, with the result that in many country villages to-day the village schoolmaster receives exactly double the income of the curate.

But unfortunately the old conditions of service, which ultimately secured the flow of candidates, no longer prevail. The inexorable tide of reform has more and more undermined the parson's last prerogative, his freehold. His work is in extreme danger of becoming standardised. His liberty is circumscribed. Jockeyed at every turn, he finds the parochial church council not always as helpful as its creators intended it to be, and even the secretariat, presumably intended as the friend of his declining years, rejoicing in the ominous title of the Pensions Authority. He spends too much time filling in forms; while, despite inflation, decade by decade his emoluments tend to be depressed ever lower and lower towards an equalitarian mean.

The result is that promising young men no longer enter the Church, save in exceptional cases. One of the saddest, bitterest things in the *Memoirs of the late Master of Trinity*, a volume conspicuous for the unexceptioned generosity of its outlook, was the simple statement, made in all friendliness, that of the 909 undergraduates entering Trinity in the years 1920 to 1924, and then on the books of the college, only 24 had taken Orders. This proportion is all too general throughout the ranks of those who are especially trained to culture and leadership. The careers master has in all honesty to advise parents that the Church as a career is unlikely to repay the cost of a university education. The Don has to suggest that there are many other professions equally patient of a sense of vocation, offering alike more liberty for thought and action and with ample spare time for various kinds of social service, and more conducive to proper standards of family living.

The Church has in fact gone far towards the standardised methods of the Church of Rome, without openly

demanding the discipline, renunciation, and celibacy which alone make them workable.

If it is indeed the traditions of learning and independent leadership which constitute the peculiar strength of the Church of England, it is high time to call a halt to the cramping, depressing efforts of the machinery of central authority, and to encourage, or at least tolerate, scope for individual enterprise in parishes. There may be risks involved, but in the crowded life of the City these are as likely to be small as the opportunities for free, responsible service are ample.

Given something approaching the existing strength of City clergy, and those fully responsible men, not a few rectors, eked out with tiros, in charge of grouped churches, as it were so many museums, there will be room for all kinds, and work for all. It is now customary, and more convenient than always strictly justifiable, for bishops to employ suffragans at someone else's expense, often with the emoluments of a canonry, whose duties go either by default or against the grain. The City rectories can clearly continue to carry all four, especially as suffragans in London are by tradition by no means unmindful of their plural responsibilities, and often take a full share in necessary parish work. There is scope, too, within reason, for all shades of doctrine, and for the special cultivation of music and the arts, their devotees and students. There are potential homes for some of the all-too-meagre band of scholars, without whom the State Church can only sink in public esteem to the level of a sect, intolerant and intolerable. There are homes for staff officers, both of the diocese and the Church at large. One City rector, who has given his life to the interests of students, is now doing a work, the importance of which cannot be over-estimated, amongst school-teachers of all grades, advising the profession and service chaplains on matters of religious education.

But the City churches would lose their *raison d'être* if they merely supported workers who, however praiseworthy, conducted their operations elsewhere. Although the Church, often like life, has a habit of paying people for the wrong things and ultimately striking a not unjust

balance, the parish remains the unit of church life. One may have to re-assess its constitution. Several may have to be grouped, perhaps into rural deaneries, as working units. But the fact remains that Christian service is essentially personal. The Established Church, no less than the Church of Rome, is saved ultimately in the parishes, not by the splendour and wisdom of prelates, but by the devotion of those humble men of good will who in the common ways of life follow Him who went about doing good.

The City cannot bear too many absentees; very few, in fact. The work of a rector, in the City as in the country, is in his parish. If he goes about his restricted area day by day, merely showing himself to all and exchanging perfunctory greetings here and there, he lays foundations invaluable in themselves, and upon which future ministrations become progressively easier. That the average town parish is utterly beyond the physical capacities of its present staff is no excuse for draining the City. There is ample work there for as many working men, not pensioners unable to cross the road, as can be found to man a full number of churches. The atmosphere is there. The churches, rich in fittings and historical associations, are either in existence or are ready to be restored after the war, with far more prospect of centuries of useful work in front of them than most churches yet to be built in new and ephemeral suburban districts. The population is assured, men and women of all kinds and classes but of one degree of good will, hungering and thirsting for the values of the Kingdom, for which, despite provision elsewhere, they are extremely unlikely to find satisfaction in their own residential districts.

The Church, the City rather and the nation, has the sites. Strategically they are unrivalled for the work of leavening a nation proud to take a leading place among the world's shopkeepers. If war conditions teach anything at all to spiritual mentors, it is that the priest ministers most effectively when he stands side by side with the laity at their daily tasks. That he is not only tolerated there but welcomed is the experience of many who in past years have worked or are still working in

parishes in the City, at the very heart of national and world economy.

Let architects and town-planners, then, place the churches. A few—a few only—of the smaller and poorly situated, already destroyed, may have to be written off. For the majority, let the undoubted needs of the suburbs be what they will, there is every possibility in the City for useful witness and service. Let them be restored, if need be re-built, staffed by men of personal gifts, of vision and responsibility, able to conceive and carry out over a period of years vigorous policies, men who can work among men and women of the world and command their respect, their admiration, and their love, and so help in their generation to maintain the ancient religious traditions of the City and keep them vital and dynamic, presenting its motto as a reality, an inspiration, and a light to the country and the world, '*Domine, Dirige Nos.*'

JAMES WALL.

Art. 5.—THE EARLIER YEARS OF KAISER WILHELM.

This draft for an article on the Kaiser's early years was written by the late Sir Valentine Chirol, who was Berlin Correspondent of 'The Times' in the 1880's. Introductory and concluding paragraphs have been added by A. L. Kennedy.

THE ex-Kaiser Wilhelm II, who died in June, combined in himself a large assortment of the qualities and defects of that strange line of ancestors whose lives form the history of Prussia. First Counts, then Marquesses, then Electors, then Kings, and for a brief space Emperors, the Hohenzollerns made the frontiers of the realm they ruled ; and their dynasty, supported by armed force, was long the personal link that joined scattered domains together. No family could have maintained its position through nine troubled centuries and asserted its authority for twenty generations in Brandenburg and Prussia if it had not possessed physical and mental qualities beyond the ordinary. Nevertheless, apart from military talent, the chief characteristics of the Hohenzollerns were violence, unscrupulousness, vanity, and a mystic belief in their own destiny. Hardly one was what we should call amiable ; only one or two (according to Emil Ludwig) were ' true noblemen.' Several were eccentric, several were pious, some were extreme misers and others lavish in squandering what their predecessors had amassed. A few more were mere weaklings ; often a gifted father was followed by a dullard son. To almost all of them their armies meant more than their people. They thought of their frontiers as variable and correspondent with their military strength. They thought of their people as owing allegiance only to themselves, and themselves as owing it to God.

William II was the grandson of the first Emperor, who also was almost the first Hohenzollern whose leading characteristic was common sense. Young William's father was the unhappy Prince who survived to reign only for a hundred days ; and his mother was the eldest daughter of Queen Victoria, a woman of admirable virtues, but who was unduly severe with her eldest son and could never reconcile herself to the misfortune of his having

been born with one arm withered. William himself probably owed much of his gasconading and tendency to indulge in heroics to an instinctive determination to hide this physical defect. His self-assertion rapidly became a habit and grew later to megalomania. It was to be made apparent very early in his career when, as a young man of thirty-one, he turned out of office Prince Otto von Bismarck, the creator of the modern German Empire and its Chancellor for a quarter of a century; and he shortly afterwards reversed the great man's policy of maintaining a treaty of alliance with Russia.

At the very moment when William ascended the throne his people obtained a startled glimpse of the length to which his self-assertiveness and lack of reticence could lead him; for his first official act was to place his widowed mother under restraint in the Castle of Charlottenburg. Scarcely had his father drawn his last breath than he ordered the palace to be surrounded by a military cordon, in order that he might recover for the Royal Archives certain State documents which the Empress held and regarded as her own property. Bismarck may have been partly responsible for this strange and harsh proceeding; but ten years later, when the Empress herself died at the Castle of Friedrichshof, Wilhelm once more sent a cordon of cavalry to the scene, and had every room in the castle ransacked by police—in vain, for the Empress had a few months before smuggled the papers out of the country through the medium of Sir Frederick Ponsonby, afterwards Lord Sysonby, who was then assistant private secretary at Buckingham Palace.

A conversation is on record which William had with Bismarck just before the young Emperor set off on his first visit to the Sultan of Turkey. William gave it as his opinion that some day Turkey might be made to serve Germany as 'a bridgehead to world dominion.' Whereupon Bismarck is reported to have replied tersely, 'world dominion is a word that has no place in my vocabulary.' Bismarck had the saner conception of the power of Germany and its limitations.

At the time of William's accession a profound change was taking place in the habits and outlook of the German people. Their traditional frugality was passing away. The great wave of industrial and commercial prosperity

which had followed Bismarck's adoption in 1879 of an elaborate system of tariff protection and State encouragement had brought with it new appetites for material well being and luxury. With his love of ostentatious travel, his white Imperial train, his splendid new yacht Hohenzollern, and his costly rejuvenation of all the royal palaces, William II encouraged among the ruling classes new standards of unwonted opulence, borrowed not only from the Court, but from the new middle classes that had sprung from the rapid expansion of commerce and industry and finance and were beginning to play a prominent part in the economic and social life of the country.

Their influence was projecting itself even into the domain of international affairs. Bismarck had set his face against Colonial adventures lest they might embroil him with England, whose influence in the world he fully recognised and valued as a counterweight to France and Russia. But he had himself been driven to make some concessions to the growing Colonial party, who preached with increasing fervour that Germany's economic development required oversea markets, that these could only be made safe for German enterprise under the German flag.

The German people were themselves fascinated by the extravagant glitter and pomp of the Imperial Court, and most of them were ready to bow down before the Emperor's growing assumption of omniscience, even in matters of art, literature, and science. But there were still some who were disquieted by the existence of a Court camarilla that was rightly suspected of pandering to the Sovereign's idiosyncracies and exerting an evil influence upon him. The chief figure in that camarilla was Prince Philip Eulenberg. Unspeakable scandals gradually gathered round his name and those of others in the Emperor's immediate surroundings, and the veil of mystery was eventually rent to pieces by Max Harden, a fearless publicist, who had never forgiven Bismarck's downfall. Bülow, though he owed his political advancement largely to Eulenberg, had already shaken him off when the revelations in the *Zukunft* pricked the unsavoury bubble, and the Emperor himself withdrew his protection and allowed the law courts to take criminal action against the fallen favourite. Others of the Emperor's friends sought refuge in flight. But never was there the slightest

insinuation made in this or in any other connection against William's private life.

Under the impulse of the young autocrat German political activities were extended to every part of the globe. The Berlin Government suddenly took an unexpected hand in the affairs of the Far East by joining with France and Russia in compelling Japan to renounce the territories she had just wrested from China in Manchuria under the treaty of Shimonoseki in 1895 at the end of the Sino-Japanese War. German diplomacy gave it confidentially to be understood in Japan that the chief purpose of Germany's cooperation with France and Russia was to exert a restraining influence on their more aggressive policy. But that it meant much more than that Japan, like the rest of the world, was soon to learn.

Of closer concern to this country was the feverish energy with which Germany resumed her activity in Africa and the hostile attitude assumed by the Wilhelmstrasse and emphasised in a vigorous Press campaign as tension increased in our relations with the Boer Republics. The Emperor, having negotiated a satisfactory deal with Lord Salisbury over Heligoland, had built great expectations on his return to power after the General Election of 1895, and had hurried over to Cowes early in August for an interview with him, which ended in sowing the seeds of profound distrust on both sides. William II returned in an angry temper, and his language in private conversation with the British Ambassador, Sir Edward Malet, foreshadowed an early explosion.

It burst upon the world in his public telegram to President Kruger after the Jameson Raid, which suggested something more than the platonic sympathy of the German Empire. It produced, however, an equally sudden emotion of popular indignation in England, and, on the immediate mobilisation of a British squadron, the German Government was quick to minimise its significance and that of preparations which had been made at the same time for sending German marines up to Pretoria from a cruiser lying in Delagoa Bay. The dispatch of the message had been at once officially, and rightly, described in Berlin as 'an action of State,' and it had its echo about a fortnight later in the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the German Empire, when William II

for the first time described his Empire as 'a World Empire.'

A fresh impetus was given to the Kaiser's ambitions when Count (afterwards Prince) von Bülow succeeded the very able, but less adventurous, Baron von Marschall at the Foreign Office. His appointment marked a further step in the growing ascendancy of the Court camarilla which was gathering round the Emperor. One of them, who was Bülow's closest ally, had been in the habit of passing on to the Emperor private letters written for that purpose by the future Chancellor, in which he described his Imperial master as 'the greatest Hohenzollern since the Great Elector or Frederick II.' Almost as soon as Bülow went to the Foreign Office he became, in fact if not in title, Chancellor of the German Empire. He was a *grand seigneur*, only partly of Prussian extraction, extremely ambitious, but no less supple, with great social and intellectual gifts, and a more sustained charm of manner than his Imperial master; but his insincerity is made manifest on every page of his spiteful and inaccurate memoirs.

It was in Bülow's terms of office, first as Foreign Secretary and afterwards as Chancellor, that the 'new course' plunged into ever deeper and more tumultuous waters, and that the feverish and ubiquitous restlessness of German policy, constantly reflected in William's flamboyant eloquence, gradually induced the great Powers of Europe outside the Triple Alliance to draw closer together in their growing apprehension of the 'German peril.' Least of all could England remain blind to the significance of the rapid expansion of Germany's naval forces, repeatedly emphasised in such phrases as 'Germany's future lies on the sea,' and 'the German Fleet must grasp the trident,' which rang out like a deliberate challenge to British sea power.

If Bismarck had declined to make room for the term 'world dominion' in his political vocabulary, the Emperor was now determined that it should bulk large in his own. Whatever had been the primary purpose of Germany's first intervention in the Far East after the Sino-Japanese War, there was no doubt now that, by the seizure of Kiao-chau after the murder of two German missionaries in Shantung, William meant to secure a big place in the

Far Eastern sun. His brother, Prince Henry, was commissioned to take out a German squadron in 1898 to announce the conversion of Kiao-chau into a great naval stronghold, and then to proceed on an official visit to Peking to drive the fear of Germany into the recesses of the Forbidden City. In view of the French and Russian hostility the British Government, unaware that Germany was already pledged not to resist a Russian occupation of the Liaotang peninsula, was quite ready to agree to a German sphere of influence in the Shantung peninsula.

It was, however, the crisis in South Africa, leading up to the outbreak of war between Great Britain and the Boer Republics in September, 1899, that once more severely strained Anglo-German relations. The German Press Bureau, reflecting not only the policy of the Wilhelmstrasse, but the Imperial temper, set to work to inflame German public opinion against England as steadily and deliberately as it had done on a former occasion during the months that preceded the Emperor's telegram to Kruger after the Jameson Raid.

William II at first hoped to make capital for Germany out of England's necessities, and, the British Government having actually made important concessions to Berlin in the Samoan question, he paid a visit to Queen Victoria soon after the beginning of hostilities in South Africa, and brought Bülow with him. At Windsor he presided over several confidential conferences with British Ministers, at which close agreement appeared to have been reached as to the possibility of an Anglo-German understanding. Indeed, Mr Joseph Chamberlain, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the most prominent figure in the British Cabinet except the Prime Minister, Lord Salisbury, thought himself justified in declaring in a speech at Leicester that, as the days had gone by for a mere policy of splendid isolation, Germany was obviously the European Power with whom the British Empire could enter into definite alliance—with the cooperation, if possible, of the United States of America.

Yet a few days later, immediately after the Emperor's return to Berlin, Bülow flung back all Chamberlain's advances in a Reichstag speech marked by the bitterest hostility. Subsequently, when two German mail steamers, suspected of carrying contraband of war to the Boers,

were seized by British warships in South African waters, the Emperor was on the point of sending a message to Lord Salisbury which would have been almost an ultimatum of war. Lord Salisbury forestalled him by hastening to order the release of the mail steamers, and to give satisfaction to the demands of the German Government in so far as the failure to discover any trace of contraband rendered them legitimate. All over Europe popular sympathies were with the Boers, but nowhere was there such deep-seated hatred of England as in Germany, or was such a flood of abuse and calumny poured out, not only on British Ministers, but upon the British soldiers fighting in South Africa.

When our fortunes in South Africa seemed to be at a low ebb, the German Government sounded the French and Russian Governments as to the expediency of some collective diplomatic pressure in London on the part of the Powers to bring the war to a close. This attempt met with no response in Paris or St Petersburg, and William called in person at the British Embassy to tell Sir Frank Lascelles that he had parried all attempts in other quarters to bring about foreign intervention in South African affairs. If we are to credit his sincerity, it must be assumed that the German Foreign Office did not always keep him fully informed as to some of its own secret manœuvres; but, though there is some evidence to show that there was room for such an assumption on other occasions, the tone of his private letters to 'dear Nikky,' published after the Russian Revolution to the considerable damage of both reputations, makes it impossible to give him in this instance the benefit of any such doubt.

It required the crisis provoked in the Far East by the Boxer Rising in the summer of 1901 to effect a somewhat sudden change in Anglo-German relations. William II saw in the Boxer excesses, and especially in the murder of his Minister, Baron von Ketteler, at Peking, the fulfilment of his lurid warning against 'the Yellow Peril.' When the Powers agreed to send international forces to the relief of the beleaguered Legations in Peking, he decided that his Army must play the leading part, and that, by hook or by crook, he must secure the supreme command for one of his favourite generals, Von Waldersee. He exhorted his troops before they sailed to strike terror

into the Chinese, and, though they reached China too late to join in the actual relief of the Legations, the 'Hun' speech* bore abundant fruit in a number of 'punitive' expeditions which wantonly embittered the Chinese far beyond Peking.

But the whole of that adventure taught the Emperor another lesson. He realised that the German expeditionary force could not have reached so remote a destination without the hospitality of the British coaling stations, and the good will of the British Fleets in the intervening seas. This was to furnish him with a fresh argument for the expansion of Germany's own naval power, but, in the meantime, it was a still more cogent reason for an understanding with England in regard to China itself.

The Anglo-German Agreement of September, 1900, on this subject was soon to give rise to a serious dispute between the two Governments as to the interpretation to be placed on some of its clauses, which, according to the German contention, did not apply to Manchuria, where Germany was extremely anxious lest she should become embroiled with Russia. For the time being, however, there was a marked tendency towards a *rapprochement* between Germany and England, and in the later stages of the South African War the Emperor, even at the cost of his popularity with his own subjects, sought to recapture British opinion by such marks of his good will as a special invitation to Lord Roberts to attend the grand manoeuvres of the German Army, when he bestowed upon him the Black Eagle, the highest of all Prussian Orders.

Ultimately, when President Kruger came to Europe to make a last attempt to secure for the Boers the foreign intervention which alone could avert a final surrender, it was plainly intimated to him from Berlin that his presence in the German capital was not desired. A still deeper impression was made on English public opinion by the Emperor's visit to England at the time of Queen Victoria's fatal illness, and the very genuine share he seemed to take in our national mourning.

* The Kaiser's words in his speech to German troops about to embark for China in 1900 were: 'Just as the Huns a thousand years ago under the leadership of Attila gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historical tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again even dare to look askance at a German.'

In the summer of 1901 conversations between London and Berlin as to the possible basis of an Anglo-German alliance were actually resumed, and carried very much further than at the end of 1898. They were conducted chiefly between Baron von Eckardstein, who, owing to Count Hatzfeldt's ill-health, was frequently in charge of the German Embassy in London, and various members of the British Cabinet, including Joseph Chamberlain again, and Lord Lansdowne, who had recently taken over the Foreign Office in order to lighten the Prime Minister's work. So anxious was Bülow, who was now Chancellor, to obtain the support of *The Times*, that he took the unusual step of inviting its Foreign Editor, Sir Valentine Chirol, to go over to Berlin, and, in a long conversation on the expediency of a definite alliance between the two countries, gave him the most emphatic assurance of his own, as well as of his Imperial master's, desire for friendship with England. He insisted, however, on the exclusion of Asia from the scope of the mutual guarantees to be exchanged in the treaty, as Germany's interests there were far less than in other parts of the world, and she had no intention of being drawn there into collision with Russia. But, as he admitted that England had vital interests there, he urged that she should safeguard them by entering into an alliance on her own account with Japan.

It was on the exclusion of Asia from the proposed Anglo-German treaty that the negotiations broke down in London, and once more a sudden outburst from Bülow in the Reichstag, in reply to a speech in which Chamberlain had hotly vindicated the behaviour of British troops in South Africa against a virulent and mendacious campaign in the German Press, marked the end of an attempt, which, on the British side at least, had been genuine, to arrive at a friendly and permanent understanding with Germany.

The German Foreign Office reflected the Emperor's feelings when it professed afterwards to have always known that no understanding with England was possible so long as Salisbury was in power in London, but all the evidence shows that the policy to which the confidential conversations were directed had in this case been pursued with Bülow under Holstein's inspiration rather than the Emperor's.

Even when the policies of the two Empires, the German and the British, drifted further apart, the Kaiser was always particularly fond of coming to England, where, as the son of a British princess and an affectionate grandson of Queen Victoria, he was received with greater intimacy than if he had been merely the head of a great and friendly nation. He made himself well liked in London society, and touched the heart of the British people by the sorrow which he displayed on the death of Queen Victoria. But in the years that followed estrangement grew between him and his uncle, King Edward VII. The two men were probably temperamentally incompatible—the one urbane, sincere, and easy going, the other brilliant, unsteady, restless, and grasping. William was often well meaning, and capable of great kindness, but like all unstable minds his was unduly influenced by his surroundings. At a German national festival he was so aggressively patriotic as to be almost undisguisedly anti-British; on his visits to England he was exuberantly pro-British. He loved to don his uniform of British Admiral of the Fleet or to play the part of an English country gentleman. And in the Privy Council room of his palace in Berlin he built in a bust of Frederick the Great over the mantelpiece and set up another to the memory of Schlieffen, who planned the invasion of France *via* Belgium, which he himself was later to carry out.

There were in fact elements of both falsity and megalomania in a prince of whom his own mother had written, when he was quite a boy, 'Willy has never been able to speak the truth, even to himself.' Nor in his maturer years did he ever look below the surface or face the deeper political realities. He could be clever and fascinating when he chose, and his quick, superficial mind easily absorbed technical details; but he had an essentially irresponsible nature. He impressed most those who knew him least. He was a man of impulse and emotion, moved easily to opposite extremes. He could be almost overwhelmingly friendly, and then on slight provocation become filled with suspicion and hatred. He was imbued with a mystic belief in the Royal House to which he belonged and in the importance of proving himself worthy of his ancestors; but he had no moral unity, no steady

purpose ; he allowed his impulses to take command of himself and his policies. He was a consummate though perhaps unconscious play actor ; and circumstances made him an autocrat and gave him the world for a stage. Only in the last spell of his life, when for a score of years he was a self-made recluse, was he allowed to be his natural self. Then he led a life of dignified seclusion which half redeemed and wholly contradicted the fame of his active career. He became in fact a respectable, talented, rather vain, but agreeable country gentleman.

Art. 6.—BIRDS AND AGRICULTURE.

1. *Food of Wild Birds*. By R. Newstead. Ministry of Agriculture, 1902.
2. *Birds of the Liverpool Area*. By Eric Hardy. T. Buncle & Co., Arbroath, for the Merseyside Naturalists' Association, 1941.
3. *My Friend the Rook*. By T. S. Hawkins. James Clarke, 1937.

THE economic value of birdlife on the farms is an important subject intimately connected with our wartime food production. It is a subject which has received a great deal of attention in the past from the friends of birds, whose propaganda has had to compete with the manufacturers of cartridges. The publicity for the shooting of birds on the farm and the preservation of game has not always agreed with what a few practical field ornithologists have found in their studies on British farms. To some of us, ornithology means something more intimate with nature as she really is than an occasional pheasant-shoot as a brief social event between lunch and dinner, or the suburban week-end 'bird-lover' watching his 'feathered friends'—two unfortunate expressions these, for the energetic young men and women of modern ornithology are not quite the poetic types one associates with 'lovers,' nor are all the birds our friends.

Efforts have been made to arouse public and scientific interest in the need to protect useful birds as part of our agricultural programme. Controversy immediately rages around rooks, bullfinches, thrushes, tits and little owls as a sequence to these appeals, without any real effort to ignore tradition and sentiment and admit the facts as they are found in the country without favour, and in relation to present-day agricultural conditions and not those of Victorian nature books. One of the most unfortunate influences upon this subject is that some wealthy protection societies pay propagandists to foster the idea that every bird is essential to our very existence, and that every bird should receive every possible protection and sanctuary, even to free meals daily, while some equally wealthy anti-protection societies pay their publicists to turn the telescope round and give the

impression that every bird which competes with game is vermin, every blade of grass or ear of grain eaten by a bird spells ruin to the farmer, and that agriculture can succeed only in a country of gamekeepers and vermin-gibbets. No doubt there is truth in a lot that they say, but when the game preservers and cartridge makers discreetly avoid the findings of the Oxford University survey into the diet of the partridge, and the national survey on the food of the little owl, because these unimpeachable facts run against their programmes, and when some 'bird-lovers' plead for the hopeless case of the sparrow and the wood-pigeon, it is time the case of the field naturalist with a field-book rather than a quotation from Tegetmeier on pheasants or Hudson on sparrows, was put to agriculture.

It has often been stated that we could not inhabit the earth for more than nine years if all the birds were destroyed, because of the ravages of insect pests which the birds keep in check. Perhaps the light of modern field biology will encourage the formation of a Royal Society for the Protection of Insects and teach the public that all insects are not pests and even more useful than the birds in checking the destructive insects are the predatory insects which parasitise the grubs and caterpillars, and but for these predatory insects man could not inhabit the earth much longer. A topical example can be drawn from the green caterpillar of the cabbage white butterfly, which in recent years has almost ruined the crops of cabbages and greens on farm and garden alike. Dr Collinge has produced some astonishing statistics, like the fact that 100,000 song thrushes in three months will consume upwards of 3,000 million insects, chiefly caterpillars; but no entomologist has had the time to estimate how many caterpillars are destroyed by the tiny *Apanteles* 'fly' in that period. However, the entomologists have worked out the fact that of the millions of lesser cabbage white butterfly caterpillars that infest vegetables, more than half are killed by the minute Braconid insect called *Apanteles glomeratus*, a relative of the useful *ichneumon* flies, more than a quarter die of disease and less than one-twentieth are killed by the birds. The enormous number of caterpillars destroyed by thrushes must represent only a small portion of the huge total of caterpillars on the

crops, and while we must protect the thrushes as valuable insect-eaters, there are even more important enemies of the pests to be remembered.

As I pointed out in a recent lecture at Liverpool University, the decision of what to protect and what to repress amongst birdlife on the farm is too often treated from a national rather than a local attitude, because it is essential that we should have a knowledge of the present economic position of birdlife in an area in relation to the changes that have taken place in crop acreage and other influences upon bird numbers and adaptable bird-habits. We cannot base our bird protection policy upon facts that are never reviewed or brought up to date, and some useful information in this matter, gathered by the Merseyside Naturalists' Association, has been sent to the Royal Lancashire Agricultural Society. For instance, the considerable increase of corn land has definitely altered the economic position of the rook, whose numbers have not increased in proportion, so that there is now a smaller ratio of rooks per corn acreage than before the war. The food supply has much to do with the importance of birds like rooks where both useful and harmful habits are shown. The rapid felling of woods for timber is reducing the nesting haunts of rooks and wood-pigeons and the winter roosting places of pigeons and carrion-crows; the Government-subsidised tile drainage of fields will check the fairly widespread pre-war increase of the redshank and curlew as nesting birds on the lowlands, so badly drained were many farms. The old mosslands and heaths cultivated in 1918 had been allowed to go out of cultivation again in that shameful waste of the land which is typical of wealthy industrial nations. The increase in the past decade of our country's population of gulls, crows, owls, sparrows, and starlings, and the decrease of corncrakes, partridges, and whinchats is of more than natural history interest. The damage by gulls to our pre-war poultry industry has been lessened by the great reduction of our poultry stocks, and the encouragement the new cornland will give to the partridge is of concern in view of the vegetarian diet of that gamebird.

These are merely isolated facts to explain my point that many of our views on bird protection and bird repression need bringing up to date. I myself have spent some con-

siderable time in recent years upon such subjects as rooks, little owls, black-backed gulls and other farm birds, and in 'Discovery' the other year I gave some of the results of censuses of farm birds in many parts of England and Wales. A large proportion of this work has been undertaken in my native north-west, chiefly because an enormous amount of time and energy is required to make any really detailed estimate of the numbers and habits of wild birds and one cannot do the main part of the work in a brief holiday or week-end: it means organising helpers and going over and over the same ground under varying conditions and seasons. Bird habits are pretty general, but they are not so conservative as to ignore changing conditions in a local district: more often will they adapt their ways to fit into the new conditions, like the Ribble estuary grey geese in winter feeding on the old potatoes on the west Lancashire farms which produce about a third of our country's potato crop, or the rooks that flock to the Delamere Forest of Cheshire when a plague of oak tortrix moths is stripping the trees of foliage.

Birds on the farm may be divided into three groups: the useful birds which are to be encouraged, the destructive birds which are to be repressed, and the 'neutral' birds whose damage or good work is negligible and which, therefore, are not to be destroyed. The difficulty arises with birds whose habits are not always the same, like the thrushes which are such useful insect-eaters in spring and summer but so destructive to soft fruits later in the year as to become really destructive birds in the orchard districts of Herefordshire and Worcestershire, particularly in a drought. The rook is another problem because it generally varies its diet between ground-insects and grain. On the edge of Liverpool there are about 2,000 rooks occupying 15 rookeries, but crops I have examined from rook-shoots contained cinders, bread crust, eggshell, bacon-rind, meat gristle, and other obvious gleanings from local rubbish tips, for the suburban rook is rapidly becoming a useful scavenger. The Rooks Order, 1940, encourages rook shooting of nestlings in May, but this does not appear to have such influence upon the number of rookeries in the country as has the felling of the tall trees favoured by the rooks. Not only has the ratio of rooks to corn-land decreased considerably with the ploughing campaign,

but the breaking up of old turf has caused wide-spread wireworm trouble, and it is upon the wireworm that the rook makes its chief food. It is strange that shooting people who denounce the rook as vermin put forward the claims of the pheasant as a destroyer of wireworm in order to justify the expensive and unnatural population of pheasants in the woods. But our gamebirds are close relatives of the poultry whose graminivorous habits are beyond dispute. Pheasants and partridges take a small number of insects, and although much publicity has been given to specimens whose crops were found full of grubs, we more often find their crops choked with peas or clover hay respectively. A keeper in Knowsley Park has often admitted that his worst depredators in his garden are the pheasants, and although this paper is not intended to be anti-sport, one cannot agree that the insignificant food value of pheasants in wartime compared with the value of the grain and crops they eat justifies their protection.

The crops which are chiefly damaged by rooks in Cheshire appear to be cereals, potatoes, and roots, but any real damage must be limited to the forage range of the local rook population. For instance, the rooks of the Wirral peninsula of west Cheshire have for years maintained a winter flight line over Liverpool to feed in the old potato fields of west Lancashire just as rooks from roosts in north Cheshire often feed north of Manchester. I have seen special winter rook-roosts of some 3,000 or more birds at Capesthorpe Hall, in Cheshire, and near Patricroft in Lancashire without noticing any damage to local crops because the foraging range of these rooks extended more than fifteen miles away. The winter flock-mixing season has a much wider range than the summer nesting season. The rook population often concentrates near good grassland in order to obtain more insect life than is afforded on arable land, and it is rather unfortunate that rook-shooting is held just at the time when the rook is most useful, for it gives its young an almost insectivorous diet simply because they require soft food. Even the partridge which is largely vegetarian rears its young on insects. When the rook population in a district exceeds the available insect supply, then the damage to grain increases in proportion, and in droughts the damage to potatoes or poultry eggs generally increases. But we

cannot bless or condemn the whole of the rook population of the British Isles merely upon the experiences of naturalists or sportsmen in the south of England because they are published from London and given a national circulation and prestige. The greatest agricultural counties are Yorkshire and Lancashire, and the conditions of birdlife and countryside north of the Trent are very different and considerably more extensive than those of the South. It is just as misleading to apply southern conditions to the north, as vice versa, but the national publicity given to the southern aspect of almost everything is considerably out of proportion.

Our policy of combating the increase of the starling and the house sparrow is not very effective. When a useful bird increases beyond its natural food supply it will usually adapt its diet to other foods, often with harmful results. The starling is at present a very useful insect eater, but it may, in the future, become a borderline bird like the rook. I have noticed its increasing damage in recent years, destroying the wheat seedlings in early spring, nipping off the blades or pulling up rows of wheat when there is no evidence of insects. For various reasons the starling continues to increase, both as a winter immigrant from North Europe and a summer nester, and in the 'Yorkshire Post' a few years ago I published a full account of some experiments we made on a Lincolnshire farm where the soil was sterilised against possible infection, and foot and mouth disease broke out when immigrant starlings had been the only contact from outside the area. The droppings of birds taken from leaves of farmside trees and shrubs where they roost has shown, in culture, their agency in the distribution of coccidiosis and other poultry diseases, a charge we can also lay against the wood-pigeon and the house-sparrow. Yet the nesting population of starlings is increasing rapidly in the vicinity of towns because of the increasing vandalism of small woods, not by ramblers but by roving youths from those cities which, like Liverpool and Manchester, and to a certain extent London, have rehoused much of their slum population in new suburban housing estates without educating the people into the art of living. Broken trees, disused old farm buildings waiting demolition, and in many cases bird-boxes erected by well-meaning people afford the starling suitable nesting haunts. In the Delamere Forest

of Cheshire I have noticed the starlings usurp the already occupied nest-holes of green woodpeckers in the trees at the Oakmere bird sanctuary, and in other parts of Cheshire and North Wales they make much use of the old holes left by the spotted woodpeckers. We must control this vandalism of the countryside if we hope to check the starling's increase.

House-sparrows are not usually found far from buildings. In a bird census I organised over west Lancashire and Cheshire, house-sparrows had a paper average of 13 per cent. of the bird population over the entire area. But inside the Liverpool suburbs they comprised 16 per cent., and inside a city park 38 per cent., but in the 2,000 acres of rural Knowsley Park they formed only 2 per cent. of the bird population. We failed to find any support for the traditional belief that the city sparrows migrate to the cornfields at harvest to form those large and destructive flocks. Liverpool was a very suitable locality for this experiment which I described in 'The Field' the other year, because a bird sanctuary in the heart of it was well populated with sparrows some eight miles from open country. By daily bird counts and other methods we failed to find any migration of young sparrows out of the heart of Liverpool, and the big sparrow flocks in the local cornfields were formed by the birds from the edge of town and the villages within the normal flight range of the sparrow. As Liverpool has about one-tenth of all the sparrows in Lancashire and Cheshire any large scale migration of the one and a half million young birds bred each year would leave a locust plague's damage from which our farms could not recover. A serious position has, however, arisen in many parts of the country from the pre-war ribbon-development of housing estates along the roads for considerable distances out of the towns and villages into the country. Wherever new houses are built, the sparrow is quick to take up nesting sites, and this ribbon development, and the extension of country bungalows as in North Wales, has increased the sparrow population in rural districts. It is those birds which contribute so much to the corn flocks. The sparrows are agents in the distribution of weeds as well as in destroying the crops. When many people watch a finch eating weed heads on the farm they conclude that

the bird is rendering good service by destroying the farmer's weeds. This is not always true : it depends upon whether or not the seeds are destroyed in the bird, or if they pass out in a germinable state and so increase the distribution of the weed. The considerable increase of the elder as a weed this century has been commensurate with the increase of the starling which is the chief bird feeding upon the soft elder berries. A group of hawthorns at the bottom of my garden formed a small winter starling roost. In the winter of 1935 I cleared the vegetation from beneath it, sterilised the soil, and left the starling droppings untouched. A seedling elder appeared the following year and is now a sturdy shrub. It is often suggested that the hardbill birds like sparrows and finches destroy their grain food and weed seeds in the gizzard, but this depends upon the type of weather, for in a very wet winter more germinable seeds are passed, and more weeds distributed, than in a dry season. Such comparative newcomers to our country's flora as rosebay willowherb, wild michaelmas daisy, American mayweed, and the age-old agricultural weeds like persicaria or red-pepper, dock, thistle, ragwort, and charlock are often as costly as insect pests.

A further increase of the sparrow has been made by those well-meaning friends of birds who daily supply liberal meals upon garden bird-tables and large nesting-boxes in suburban sanctuaries. The bulk of the birds thus attracted are house-sparrows, and in many London and Liverpool parks the habit of feeding the birds increases the aggressive sparrow to the disadvantage of the more timid chaffinch and titmouse which are much more useful birds. The feeding of sparrows during wartime could be prohibited and the food like stale bread reserved for our poultry.

Since the last war, the alien little owl has spread over our countryside until it is now widely distributed as far as Yorkshire and south Lancashire. The countryman has long been educated to look upon the owls as useful destroyers of rats and field-mice, but a very strong opposition has been raised by game-preserving interests against tawny owls and little owls which are shot in considerable numbers as vermin solely because they take a few game chicks. Long before the British Trust for Ornithology

organised its national investigation into the food of the little owl, I had access to Earl Spencer's game coverts at Brampton Ash, Northamptonshire, which is not far from the Oundle estate where Lord Lilford introduced this bird to the English countryside. More than a thousand head of game were being reared in the three rearing seasons when Coker, the gamekeeper, permitted us to examine the nesting sites of little owls. Practically all the food remains comprised the bones and fur of mammals like voles and field-mice, remains of sparrows and many wing-covers of beetles. The term 'vermin' has generally been applied to birds and beasts predatory upon game, even to the smallest point of view; but game is reared for sport, not food, and in wartime when game preservation cannot be afforded, we must look to the interests of the nation's war effort and confine our vermin list to things inimical to our agricultural effort. We have so reduced our poultry stocks that on slight charges of damage the little owl should not be persecuted, and in the largest poultry-rearing area in the country—North Lancashire and West Riding—the little owl is not by any means an abundant bird. In any case, the unbiased report of the national little owl investigation was not subsidised to find evidence in support of game preservation or to suppress anything to the contrary. If the real truth be admitted, our wartime agricultural policy has such a heavy responsibility that we cannot possibly afford game, which, despite their food value, are as costly to rear as wood-pigeons and rabbits. The very thorough investigation organised from Oxford University the other year caused no small sensation to naturalists and countrymen alike when it disclosed the unfortunate facts that the diet of the partridge comprises 42 per cent. grass, clover, and leaves, 21 per cent. grain, 20 per cent. seeds, 7 per cent. flowers and buds, 6 per cent. roots including sugar beet, and least of all in its food, insects which formed only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and were almost solely used to rear the chicks. Wheat, barley, and oats were amongst the food of the 'little brown bird' we had always been brought up to regard as the farmer's friend feeding almost entirely upon insects. And yet publicity continues to be given during this war to the partridge's value as an insect-eater! In the first fortnight of the partridge chicks' lives, animal food like insects formed over

90 per cent. of their diet and plant food less than 10 per cent. ; in the third week the diet comprised roughly equal amounts of insects and crops, but after the third week, plant food formed over 96 per cent. and insect food about 3 per cent. So the game classics erred, for the persecuted rook has an insect diet of just over 40 per cent., and 40 per cent. of harmful insects like wireworms and leather-jackets more than counterbalances 60 per cent. of plant food, much of which may be lost grain gleaned from stubble.

In the very small list of destructive birds on the land, we have the names of house-sparrow, carrion-crow, wood-pigeon, pheasant, and partridge. The black-backed gull, the black-headed gull, and the herring-gull do a certain amount of good work, including some useful pest destruction behind the ploughs, but they have increased to such numbers that they are crowding out of the countryside many more useful birds. Many of our bird-lovers have yet to learn that we cannot protect and increase all the birds in the country ; we often hear reference to the 'balance of nature' and the dangers of upsetting the balance, but our bird population is not static : certain birds are increasing and others declining in numbers according to the changing conditions of the countryside, and when there is competition for limited nesting haunts or feeding haunts, the more aggressive species crowd out the others. The increase of the black-headed gulls has been at the expense of terns, the increase of the herring-gulls on the North Wales coast for instance has decreased many more interesting cliff birds, while the black-backed gulls, which are taking to nesting on inland heaths in increasing numbers, not only make serious destruction to poultry farms over a wide range but prey upon thrushes, larks, and other birds. I have watched the nesting colony of lesser black-backed gulls on Simonswood Moss amidst south Lancashire farms grow to over 150 birds and now a few herring-gulls nest with them. Most of the local farmers have had to give up keeping ducks. During the last war the eggs of the black-headed gull were widely used for food without any effect upon the gull population, and already at our biggest black-headed gullery on the Cumberland coast at Ravenglass, where 50,000 gulls nest, land army girls have harvested the eggs daily during the

laying season. From the Yorkshire cliffs fifty parties of egg-gatherers have obtained 200,000 herring-gull eggs to augment the very depleted but very necessary egg food of town folk. These eggs are just as nutritious as poultry eggs, and we have always found them welcome food when staying near the gulleries. The Scottish Society for the Protection of Wild Birds issued a protest against this wartime use of gull eggs for food, but quite apart from the fact that no average person interested in birds would prefer to see the stricken poor of much blitzed London and Liverpool—as well as Greenock—go short of food when such an abundance is available in the countryside, it cannot be any more morally wrong to eat gull eggs than poultry eggs. These propagandists seem not to know that for years before the war brought our food shortage, the keepers at the famous bird sanctuaries at Ravenglass, Ainsdale, and elsewhere used regularly to smash the eggs of the gulls in order to discourage their breeding and give the more useful and interesting birds a chance to nest. We have merely to decide whether useful eggs are to be smashed and wasted as in the luxury days of pre-war, or if we become sensible enough to avoid starvation amidst plenty. There is not the slightest danger of egg-harvesting endangering our gulls with extermination. Indeed, if the bird laws could be altered to permit a limited shooting season so that roast gull—a well known naval and lighthouse dish—could augment our meat food, British birdlife as a whole would benefit considerably. I am sure some suburban birdlovers would have a shock if they knew how realistic bird-sanctuary keepers had to be in pre-war years in order to preserve their rare birds, and not only destroy hundreds of gulls' nests, but shoot hundreds of coot on the East Anglian bird sanctuaries, net sparrows in other sanctuaries, and in some cases shoot down their flocks of Canada geese which became so numerous as to present expensive bills for crop damage on the local farms.

In the hard frost early in 1940 we lost a considerable number of useful thrushes, robins, stonechats, titmice, herons, and other birds which were starved out in the weeks of frozen ground and water, but fortunately the bulk of the smaller birdlife appear to have recovered their numbers. I include the heron amongst the useful birds

because, like the weasel and the stoat (and to a certain extent the fox) it destroys a much more appreciable number of field-mice, young rats, and voles than my sporting friends will admit. One of the former keepers of the heronry at Ince Blundell Hall in Lancashire used to shoot and eat the herons until he found a full grown rat in the crop of one bird he shot, whereafter he gave them every protection.

I think the whole trouble of the mistaken views on 'vermin' in the country arises from the age-old subservience of agriculture to sport. The great land-owning barons and squires with totalitarian powers in the country lived primarily for sport which by harsh laws they reserved to themselves, and when agriculture grew only slowly into an industry out of serf labour it failed to shake off the shackles of sport. The man who owned the land in Victorian times rarely worked it, but leased it to farmers who must tolerate the game and a distrustful gamekeeper. The tenants were brought up to understand that pheasants and partridges were more valuable than poultry; hares and deer more important than beasts and swine. We were rich then: we could afford to waste much of our land and its crops for hunting and shooting. The land can stand a great deal of sport in normal times, but when war reminds us that our land grows only 40 per cent. of our food we can waste nothing. We must realise that many of our peace time pleasures, including game preservation, are millstones around the neck of our desperate war effort. When we come to examine the facts from the point of view of the nation as a whole, from the needs of forty million Britishers instead of our own little shooting syndicate, we discover that our ideas on vermin no longer apply, for our game birds are now vermin amongst the crops just as are the rabbits we carefully preserved from poachers. The town bird-lover must change his views about feathered friends, for even more destructive to food crops than the squire's pheasants and partridges are the village sparrows and the sanctuary's wood-pigeons. The food position is such that we cannot protect destructive birds merely because some inexperienced bird-lovers issue an appeal for them, nor can we shoot useful birds like little owls merely because they interfere with the sport of a minority. Some of the damage which is purely local includes the

cases where bullfinches visiting an orchard will damage buds, when wild geese come inland to graze on young clover and wheat as on the Lincolnshire Wolds, when flocks of migrating larks destroy winter wheat and early spring-sown oats in East Anglia, or when blackbirds in the Weald attack strawberries, gooseberries, currants, cherries, apples, pears, and plums. Too often this earns a bad name for the birds generally. The bad name of the little owl has grown from a few local incidents which were given exaggerated publicity.

In conclusion I would appeal to those who have the power or the influence to make decisions regarding bird protection or bird repression during wartime to place subsidised propaganda on the same footing as country superstitions, and to give a much fairer hearing to the recent investigations of the field biologists—amateur and professional—who have neither the cares of rearing pheasants nor keeping together a society's subscriptions. One of the many good things lost by the war was a new scheme to improve the Wild Birds' Protection Act. It originated from the Herefordshire County Council in one of the most agricultural districts of the country, was modified by the Somerset County Council, and then submitted to all the other county and borough councils in England and Wales as well as to the County Councils Association and the Association of Municipal Corporations. Mr Hansen, Clerk to the Herefordshire County Council, told me that thirty-one counties and thirty-one boroughs were prepared to support the scheme for the consolidation of the various and confusing local alterations and amendments of our national bird laws. The main idea was a national effort through the local authorities to secure the introduction of legislation amending, consolidating, and simplifying the somewhat cumbrous Bird Acts, and draft headings of the proposed Bill were submitted to all the local authorities. The Bill aimed to protect throughout the whole year wild birds, other than game birds, and their nests and eggs with some exemptions in favour of owners and occupiers of land and persons authorised by them, but these exemptions were not to apply to a county or county borough list of birds scheduled for special protection in that particular area during the whole or part of the year. There was also to be another county

list of birds not to be protected in the area, even in a bird sanctuary, because of their damage. In other words the listing of useful birds for protection and harmful birds for repression was to be done by the county or borough authorities and their schedules were to be analogous to bye-laws; but Somerset made the further suggestion that the Secretary of State should remain the confirming authority.

If we are to make full use of the value of wild birds to our wartime agriculture, we shall need some legislation different from the present bird laws. At present local authorities suggest their amendments of the Act to the Home Office, but the committees that deal with these matters are generally politicians with no knowledge of local birdlife and considerably influenced by propaganda, although this is often to the best end. To give an instance, Liverpool Corporation has frequently been called upon in recent years to amend its local bird protection bye-laws, to permit rook-shooting in one of the city parks. When the subject first came up to the Parks and Gardens Committee, I was one of a number of people called to give evidence before them, and I was amazed to find that no single member of the committee making this important decision had any knowledge of the birds or their rookery. They spent some time debating the possibilities of a shoot at a Gateacre rookery which had been extinct for three years, and when the matter came up in the city council, similar ignorance of the subject was displayed. The matter was not settled, and when I noticed the subject again on the agenda in the June, I pointed out to the late Sir Thomas White, leader of the council, that the young rooks had already flown; so the matter was hurriedly dropped.

With the extraordinary powers of wartime, the subject could be settled in each district by the local war agricultural committee in consultation with up-to-date information from experienced people in contact with local birdlife and agriculture. The repression of harmful birds should be in the wise methods adopted against the peregrine falcon, which is reduced only by authorised people, and only in the limited areas where it endangers the pigeon post. Regarding the protection of birds, the help of voluntary organisations like the Association of Bird

Watchers and Wardens, the British Empire Naturalists' Association, and the Yorkshire Naturalists' Union would considerably assist policemen who often complain that they do not know enough about birds to recognise the protected species. Since the war began, we have given a lot of time to public speaking, in the south as well as the north, for a better understanding of the importance of birdlife to agriculture. Although I am keenly interested in bird-watching and bird protection in normal times, I have not been afraid to point out in the 'Farmer and Stockbreeder' that we must have more shooting from 'hides' if we are to check the wood-pigeon damage. I found ready support for a suggestion I made when explaining our efforts to a meeting of the Hastings and St Leonards Natural History Society last year, namely that we should take steps to avoid an increase of the house-sparrow when we encourage the planting of more cover for insectivorous birds, and to avoid river pollution and gorse fires which have an adverse effect upon useful birds. It has been my experience that the bulk of people interested in bird-watching as a hobby are realistic enough to appreciate that all birds are not our feathered friends, although by far the majority are very necessary members of the countryside. Unfortunately, public interest cannot likewise be concerned for the protection of our useful insects like ladybirds, lacewings, ichneumon flies and other predators, and of useful mammals like bats, weasels, badgers, and shrews !

ERIC HARDY.

Art. 7.—GERMANY AS A SPIRITUAL AND WORLD PROBLEM.

IF we accept the view—and I accept it without hesitation—that the war of 1939 only represents a resumption of the war that began in the year 1914, then we cannot escape the conclusion that Europe and the world are confronted with what may roughly be defined as a German problem. The problem is not of an economic character—that will become sufficiently clear if we recall what we know of Germany's pre-1914 economic situation. At no other time in her history was Germany so prosperous as at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. During the two decades immediately preceding the outbreak of war (1914) the national income had doubled and the national wealth was increasing at the rate of ten thousand million marks per annum. Emigration had fallen to a very low level—only 23,000 in the last five years before 1914. Unemployment was practically non-existent. There were heavy investments of German capital in all parts of the world. In a word, Germany was flourishing, and, particularly in British circles, this state of affairs was regarded as a guarantee of peace. Yet the outcome was war.

These facts probably provide better evidence than any theoretical dissertation could do that the German problem is in fact not of an economic character, but that it arises very largely from other factors. No doubt, the present war, which was deliberately planned and prepared by Germany's Nazi rulers, does seem to have been impelled by economic causes, to have been launched by way of a desperate people against its exploiters. And it is undoubtedly true that in connection with the present war Germany's calamitous economic situation as it was before the accession of the Nazis ranks high among the German motives. In spite of that, however, this calamitous economic situation was not the cause of the events with which we are confronted to-day, but merely a means of hastening the occurrence of those events. The economic tension generated certain forces, but the direction and operation of those forces was determined by factors that lay outside the economic sphere.

The tendency that impelled the impoverished Germany

of 1933—when the present war really began—was the same as that which impelled the prosperous Germany of 1914—namely, the tendency for war. Indeed, the impoverishment of post-war Germany was regarded by those who represented this tendency as a welcome aid to its restoration after its collapse in 1918. Hitler, in one of his many speeches, openly declared that in his opinion it was fortunate that Germany had lost the war. In telling that, he was—consciously or unconsciously—pointing out the most important fact that it was Germany's defeat in the war that rendered possible the developments which brought the great mass of the people under the spell of the ideologies that had long existed in Germany, but only gained a hold over the emotions of the masses—we cannot speak of minds in this connection—when expressed in the vulgar and brutal form of National Socialism.

Thus, if it is true that the present war represents a resumption and continuation of the war of 1914, then both these wars must have been impelled by the same fundamental motives. Whether a milder and more generous Versailles Treaty would have veered Germany in a different direction, I venture to doubt.

Germany, as we know, has always repudiated responsibility for the war of 1914: whether rightly or wrongly is of little importance to our purpose. What is important is the question: What was the attitude of Germany as a political and spiritual unit to humanity's central problem, the problem of peace or war? Did she not want war at all, or was it merely that she did not want to start in 1914? And does she deny her war guilt on strategical or philosophical grounds?

In order to be able to answer these questions we must recall certain facts which, particularly after the foundation of the Bismarckian Empire, influenced German spiritual life in a particular way.

German national sentiment, having after the foundation of the Empire in 1871 reached a temporary saturation point in the internal political sense, applied itself to external political questions, advancing various claims and demands which did not stop short of the re-distribution of the world. This demand had nothing to do with the idea of the German philosopher Hegel, that the cosmic

spirit raises a certain nation above all others in every age, thereby imposing upon it the mission of leadership in the interests of human progress. The German Nationalists, or at least a certain group of them, did not want any mission, any alternative, but a final solution. The world, they said, must decide whether it wanted to be British or German. They did not advance any moral or juridical reasons in support of this demand, but they did put forward a reason of biological character. A vigorous creature, they argued, must expand—naturally at the expense of the less vigorous, which have no biological right to survive; an attitude that is reminiscent not only of Malthus, but even more of Frederick II, who coined the phrase concerning 'unjustified existences.'

The German Nationalists did not fail to indicate how their supreme demand—that the world should become German—was to be achieved. Belgium, Holland, Denmark, and the greater part of France were to be incorporated with the German Empire, together with the Crimea and Bessarabia. Germany needed space, living space, and it was to be acquired from her neighbours, both in the East and the West, who were to be expatriated to other continents, their native lands being settled by Germans.

The nationalistic and political authors who evolved this programme were also joined by German novelists. In one novel, set in the year 2021, the Germans successfully invade Britain, and Britain is obliged to cede Canada and the East Indies to them. The German Nationalists in general devoted much attention to this proposal to invade Britain.

Remarkably enough, at the time these plans for the re-shaping of the world in the interests of the Germans were evolved and debated, the theory concerning a German master race also cropped up, and proposals were made for the improvement of the race and the preservation of its purity. Non-Germans living in the German Empire must be prevented from producing children. It was even suggested that there should be human stud farms for Germans on lonely islands in the North Sea and the Baltic.

Naturally, all the advocates of this German 'new order' were quite aware that their somewhat ambitious

plans could not be realised without war, or rather, without a series of wars. But it was precisely this fact, namely, that the attainment of their goal inevitably involved war, that strengthened them in their resolution to adhere to their plans. For in their view war was the greatest and most glorious achievement that was granted to the human race; war alone brought the revelation of Truth and Justice, therefore a permanent state of war would be the ideal state. The question posed by the Nationalists was: 'Whom does the nation love with the greatest ardour?' And the answer was: 'Not Goethe, or Schiller, or Wagner, but Barbarossa, Frederick the Great, Blücher, Moltke, and Bismarck—the hard men of blood!' A prominent soldier (General Bernhardt), in a book which became a best seller, wrote that the preservation of peace can and must never be the aim of policy.

Such, very briefly, are the ideas which were disseminated and read by Germans in countless books, pamphlets, and newspaper articles during the period between the founding of the Bismarckian Reich and the outbreak of war in 1914.

Then, as well as later, these ideas were described as mere excrescences, extremist spoutings that could not influence the practical policy of the Reich. But extremist ideas which find expression and a hearing among a people never originate in a vacuum. There must always be something, however latent, from which they spring.

However, from the practical point of view, the greatest importance attaches to the fact that all the men who exerted a decisive influence on German life after the collapse of 1918, as well as those who have been exclusively dominating it since 1933, have been either representatives of the same extremist ideology or decisively under its influence. One of them is Adolf Hitler. Indeed, if you read his book, 'Mein Kampf,' you will not find in it a single idea that was not expressed by the extreme German Nationalists before him. His entire political and philosophical outlook—and, of course, also that of his followers—is a faithful reflection of the extremist ideology of the pre-1914 period.

The problem with which we are confronted may be condensed into the question: Does this state of affairs represent an organic development of the German national

character which inevitably had to culminate in National Socialism ; or does it represent an extreme phenomenon, which, though not unconnected with the national spirit, could not have come to pass without a concatenation of certain definite circumstances ?

In order to be able to answer this question we must seek to define the German national character. Significantly enough, it is Germans who have written most about the German character, and, still more significantly, many of the greatest Germans have condemned it. I do not wish to waste the reader's time with quotations in this connection. The views of Goethe, Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Hoelderlin, etc., are too well known to make that necessary. However, there is one German philosopher whom I would like to quote. He is Leopold Ziegler, a winner of the Goethe prize, a man of comprehensive vision and a deeply patriotic German. As recently as the year 1925 he wrote :

'Nevertheless, this nation of congenital protesters is so like a whipped cur, so abjectly submissive, in a spiritual sense so completely adjusted to mass thinking, feeling, and willing on party lines, that Schopenhauer, despite his personal embitterment, was almost right when he reproached his countrymen with boundless stupidity and said he was ashamed to belong to such a people.'

That is the judgment of a contemporary great German, a patriotic German.

Now, how did the Germans come to be like this ? For the answer we need not even go back to Tacitus. The development of the Germans into 'whipped curs,' 'submissive creatures' began with the triumph of Luther, and was completed through the Prussian way of life. Nazi Germany represents a sort of new edition.

Luther freed the German Christian from Rome, but delivered him up without pity to his own masters. According to Luther, the rulers of the people held power by the grace of God, and to disobey them was a worse sin than murder. Disobedience to the State in all circumstances constituted a moral wrong.

Well, Calvin also enjoined passive obedience to authority, yet Calvin has not prevented the Anglo-Saxon world from becoming the pioneer of human progress. The

theory that Calvin weakened his doctrine of passive obedience by his observation that the people must be protected against 'inferior magistrates' is not sufficient to explain the colossal difference between the effects of Calvinism and those of Lutheranism. For Luther also said on one occasion that many rulers of the people were the worst fools and knaves on earth, yet no one in Germany exploited this dictum of Luther in order to achieve a mitigation of the individual's subjection to authority. The reason was that in Germany there was something else, in addition to Lutheranism, that was specifically German, namely, militarism. At first this militarism was clumsy, uncouth, but gradually it became more polished, more differentiated, better organised, until Prussia gave it a form that became a model to all Germany, after which it developed further, until the entire German people came to take their spiritual, intellectual, and political orientation from it. This development, as I have said, began with Luther. He made the worldly overlord into a spiritual overlord as well, to revolt against whom was a mortal sin. Though he did not deprive the German people of their religion, he deprived them of their Church and delivered them up to the barracks. There was no universal conscription as yet, but there were hundreds of feudal lords, with their hundreds of feuds and wars—it was amid these conflicts that the pre-barracks German was born.

The manner in which the Prussian State came into existence—it was the first German colonial possession—sufficiently explains why it was that Prussia was the first country in Europe to introduce conscription. At the outset conscription was exploited hesitantly, partly for financial reasons but also from fear of arming the masses, for at that time the men who constituted the State were as yet unaware how easy to mould and lead these masses were. In the Prussia of Frederick II the Army was already that part of the State for which the greatest respect was demanded and enforced. However, there was still a wide gulf between the Army and the citizens, who were despised by the haughty military nobility. In the year 1763 King Frederick II had to forbid the titled officers of his Army to beat the citizens. That was 548 years after England's Magna Carta, 74 years

after the Declaration of Rights, and 26 years before the French Revolution. I think these thrashings explain the lack of what might be called civilian courage in the German citizen of which even an autocrat like Bismarck complained a hundred years after Frederick II's prohibition of them. Yet this order marked the beginning of a process which, through many stages of development, led to the total military State as it existed in Wilhelminian Germany and as we see it to-day, at the peak of its perfection, in Nazi Germany. In the course of this process the German citizen was taken in hand and moulded by the State. Prominent soldiers wrote books that went far beyond purely military matters and extended to the spheres of philosophy, outlook, world politics. The privileged position which the Army occupied in the body politic, and the steadily increasing financial demands which it laid on the treasury, made it necessary to justify the existence of this expensive apparatus in the eyes of the people. Naturally, these books first found an echo in nationalistic circles, but imperialistic ambitions also spread to the most moderate sections of the people at large through such factors as the realisation of national unity by Bismarck, the example of Britain's riches and power, France's progress and prosperity, and the unprecedented expansion of world trade. The Army, the potential instrument of these ambitions, gained in popularity, influence, and power. Philosophy and science provided the moral and scientific backing for the progressive militarisation of the national life. In schools and universities the dead glory of the Holy Roman Empire was revived and hopes and ambitions for new glory and greatness fanned into flame. The leaders of German economic life were also infected, and they demanded that the markets where they bought and sold should be made politically, that is to say, militarily, dependent on Germany. Even the priests of the two Churches, the Roman and the Lutheran, did not stand aside, but, on the contrary, gave the whole tendency religious sanction. And parallel with all this, hundreds of thousands of young men, as conscripts, were being drilled, both physically and mentally, in the barracks, and converted into perfect military robots who viewed things and events in the world with mechanised minds.

In this way Germany became a State, the centre of which was occupied by a colossal military apparatus like some mighty idol. And this idol pumped into the hearts and minds of the citizens and masses surrounding it those emotions and ideas which were required to ensure that its divinity should not be doubted and that its power should increase. The mighty idol taught the people that war was not a calamity, not an aberration, not barbarous savagery, but something ordained by the Creator. And so it was amid the jubilation of the citizens whose ancestors of more than a century ago had been thrashed by Prussian officers, amid the jubilation of the masses who in the course of time had become whipped curs and submissive slaves, that this idol of the German Reich in 1914 went to war—and was defeated.

What happened next? Some Germans remembered that Germany had also had great men who had not lived for and from the barracks. The new German Republic adorned itself with the name of Weimar, thereby proclaiming its intention to travel by a road that was not lined with the uniformed robots of the past. The tragic side of this was that the German people as a whole had remained practically uninfluenced by those of its great sons who had earned for it the title as a people of poets and thinkers. The word Weimar meant little to the German people. There was also the mediocrity of those who led the Weimar Republic; and, last but not least, there was the shortsighted, psychologically mistaken policy of the victors. However, all this was not decisive. The factors and forces that decisively and finally prevented the triumph of the spirit of Weimar lay elsewhere. The Versailles Treaty permitted the defeated Reich to maintain an Army of a hundred thousand men. True, this was a small Army as compared with the former one, but the spirit of the men who led and fashioned it was the same as that which had created the total militarism which in 1914 had jubilantly, and amid the rejoicings of the German masses, marched to war. And this small Army, if too weak to venture on a campaign of conquest beyond the frontiers of the Reich, was nevertheless strong enough to rule within the Reich. And the sole aim of this rule was for the Army to become as great, or rather greater, than it was in 1914.

Side by side with this new Army imbued with the old spirit there were the old extremists, whose mentality I have described. They united under a new banner, that of National Socialism. Their programme was the same as that of the old extremists. In 1923—that is, barely five years after the defeat—Hitler and Ludendorff attempted their putsch in Munich. It failed; but Hitler was released four years and three months before the expiration of the sentence imposed upon him. National Socialism, profiting by past mistakes, grew, experienced setbacks, but grew again and went on growing, favoured as it was by the economic misery of the mass of the German people. After its accession to power in 1933, National Socialism, by means of the crime of incendiarism, made itself absolute master of the German State. It had set itself a gigantic programme which could only be carried out with the aid of the whole nation. But when a people that has already made such colossal sacrifices is to be persuaded to make still heavier ones, is to be made to understand that guns are more important than butter, meat, milk, clothes, books, then it must be offered some sort of compensation. True, the Germans were still 'whipped curs' and 'submissive slaves,' but even slaves might revolt if driven too far. So National Socialism resorted to a device first recommended by Bismarck, who said that the German will stand anything at home so long as he can cut a dash before the rest of the world. National Socialism applied this principle, which in any case resembled its own. They informed the German robot of the barracks that he was superior to all other peoples: there is no more willing tool than a slave who has been convinced that he is a master. And so National Socialism succeeded in winning the mighty energies of a talented people for a single purpose: to revive the German idol which was defeated but not exterminated in 1918, and to forge for it the mightiest war machine that any people ever possessed. This machine, combined with and supported by an unscrupulousness, cunning, and perfidy that would put a Macchiavelli completely in the shade, was then unloosed on a world stricken with blindness, a naïve world that had lulled itself into a false sense of security. So to-day we are confronted with a greater peril than before in history, for we have

to contend against total militarism allied with total barbarism.

How is this danger to be averted? Britain has already gone far on the way that may lead to a solution. Unfortunately, and tragically, it had to be the way of war. But it is a war that Britain must win, otherwise the whole sense and purpose of two thousand years of Christian effort will be distorted into a tragically grotesque shape and the world will be de-humanised.

But after the victory there will still remain a problem, a no less serious problem: what to do with the German people? It must be made impossible for the German people ever again to re-establish their war machine. They must not be allowed to possess a single weapon of war. This cannot be accomplished by anything like a permanent occupation of the whole of Germany; that would be an impossible task. But it should be possible to convince the German people that its national and political unity will be in no danger even if it possesses no soldiers and armaments. For this purpose it would be necessary to guarantee its frontiers, after defining them on the basis of justice towards Germany herself, as well as towards other peoples. This guarantee has to be given by all free nations of the world, united in a federation or in a league—the name doesn't matter—and Germany will have to belong to this league or federation from the first. The armaments which Germany will have to surrender must be placed at the disposal of the new Union of Nations as the basis of its military equipment. But it would be of the highest psychological importance that the position of other nations in relation to their own military apparatus should be that of a mandate, *plus* the right to use it in self-defence. Universal conscription must be abolished in all countries. The guarantee given to Germany on the lines I have indicated would free the German robot of the fear of encirclement inspired by his leaders, and thereby also free him from the unrestricted rule of a total militarism. That would constitute a most important step, for it would open the hearts and minds of the German people to the voices of those great Germans whom total militarism has hitherto prevented from exerting their influence.

E. MÜLLER-STURMHEIM.

Art. 8.—THE GENERAL HOSPITAL SERVICE.

P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) Report on the British Health Services as to London, 1937.

TWENTY years ago the financial plight of the voluntary hospitals was serious. King's College and the London hospitals had closed wards owing to lack of means, and others had indicated their intention to take a similar course. The costs, which during the years 1914 to 1918 had increased by 138 per cent., were falling to some extent, but important items in the expenditure, such as the salaries of nursing and domestic staffs, were likely to become stabilised at the increased figure. A committee appointed by the Minister of Health, under the chairmanship of Lord Cave, at the beginning of the year 1921 estimated that the deficiencies of the voluntary hospitals for that year throughout Great Britain would be not less than 1,000,000*l.* They found that the position in Scotland was more hopeful than in England, and 'mainly due, apart from careful management, to the increase of workmen's contributions,' which they observed to be a growing feature of many Scottish hospitals, and to the generous legacies bequeathed to them. It was in the 'mass contributions' that the committee believed that the key would be found to the solution of the financial problem. Schemes for collecting weekly contributions of a penny or twopence from wage earners had been in operation at Sunderland Royal Infirmary and other voluntary hospitals in the North for many years, and the committee advocated their extension to the South, especially to London, where the financial situation seemed to be particularly serious. At the same time the organisation of collections in that area was one of special difficulty, and the committee were not prepared to say whether it should be done by the Hospital Saturday Fund or some other agency. With the encouragement of King Edward's Hospital Fund, and largely through the wise guidance of the late Lord Hambleden, the voluntary hospitals combined to form the Hospital Saving Association—saving, not savings, according to the popular error—to save the hospitals by collecting weekly contributions of threepence from wage earners earning less than 6*l.* per week. As an additional means of assisting

the financial position the committee recommended the appointment of a Central Commission, with local committees to administer State grants, and to secure that adequate accommodation would be provided and maintained to meet the needs of the growing population. The Commission was appointed in 1924, but as conditions did not enable the national exchequer to provide the necessary funds it ceased to exist in 1928.

In 1929 a silent revolution in the hospital service of the country was effected by the passing of the Local Government Act. Public discussion was almost wholly concentrated on what were called the 'derating' provisions. In fact, the Act was largely due to the financial difficulties of hard-hit industrial areas. In giving relief to industry revenue was lost to Local Authorities. This had to be made good from the national exchequer to the extent of an estimated loss of 24,000,000%. Because the central government provided this money it was given greater control. The principal agency through which this was to be exercised was the Ministry of Health, which was empowered to vary the grant to any Local Authority, if it were dissatisfied with its efficiency and progress in public health matters. This indirectly affected the hospital service, so that a sum larger than that refused to the Voluntary Hospitals Commission was granted to the Local Authorities. This financial arrangement, which is still in operation, has an important bearing upon the present position. It is time for the derating provisions to be reviewed under the Act, and it is recognised that it is impossible to do so in the middle of a war, when there has been a complete dislocation of the factors forming the basis of a complicated formula to determine the amount. Nevertheless the adjustment will have to be made at the first opportunity.

Even more far reaching than the financial provisions of the Act of 1929 were the sections which abolished the Boards of Guardians and transferred their powers to the councils of counties and county boroughs. Under the Act the infirmaries might cease to be part of the Poor Law services and be transferred to the Public Health Committee of the county councils, upon whom was placed the important responsibility to provide adequate hospital accommodation in its area, though before adding to it

they were required to consult the voluntary hospital authorities. Moreover, the council hospitals are open to all, irrespective of means.

The Local Government Act of 1929, although it was not recognised at the time, is now becoming appreciated as an historic measure comparable to the Education Act of 1902. There are analogies between the position of the voluntary schools of forty years ago and the voluntary hospitals, though it must not be pursued too closely. The Local Authorities took over no less than 120,000 beds, roughly double the number in the voluntary hospitals, though the latter would like to think that they make up in quality of service what they lack in quantity. The Act gave the Local Authorities power to render financial aid to the voluntary hospitals. They might make payments for services rendered or make grants up to a limited amount from the rates. The former power, which was an extension of earlier legislation, has been exercised all over the country in a wide variety of agreements in which there is little uniformity. In some cases, as, for example, the treatment of venereal disease, they deal with matters which the Local Authorities prefer not to undertake, while in others it seems to be more economical to add to the output of the voluntary hospitals' organisation, as in making pathological examinations. The tendency, however, is for the Local Authorities to cancel these agreements and to extend their own services. While voluntary hospital authorities have generally been willing to make these agreements, there has been less readiness to apply for grants in aid and on the part of the Local Authorities to give them. They raise the important question of principle whether Local Authorities can make grants of public money without having some voice in their expenditure. Some have wished to make somewhat exacting conditions while others have refused the offers of voluntary hospitals' committees to welcome representatives from the Local Authority. The total effect, however, is that up and down the country a number of Local Authorities have established direct financial relations with the voluntary hospitals.

The Local Authorities have used the powers given them by the Local Government Act with varying degrees of readiness, and some have not yet even placed the hospitals

under the control of the Public Health Committee. It is not without significance that the halting authorities are in many cases the same as those which were not active under the Education Act, 1902. Anxiety about increasing the rates rather than the needs of the area has been the controlling factor. Among the progressive authorities the London County Council have taken a leading place. The task of taking over forty-one hospitals with 27,000 beds from the Boards of Guardians was an enormous undertaking. The buildings, many of them old, were in all states of repair and adequacy, and the conditions of work of the staffs were as varied. The extent to which the prejudices against the old infirmaries have disappeared and to which the cooperation of the general practitioners has been obtained are among the chief testimonies to the Council's success, for which the wise counsel of Sir Frederick Menzies was largely responsible. Prejudice is a tiresome thing, and a small but important contribution to its removal was the renaming of the infirmaries with, in many cases, saints' names, like any old-established voluntary hospital. It is with attention to such details that the L.C.C. have carried out a great piece of organisation as the largest hospital authority in the world, responsible also for the mental hospitals and those for infectious diseases. In addition, it became the responsible authority for the fine post-graduate school attached to the hospital at Hammersmith.

In dealing with the conditions of service of the staffs the nurses naturally took a foremost place. Public attention was drawn to the subject by the publication in 1932 of the report of an important commission appointed by 'The Lancet'

'to inquire into the reasons for the shortage of candidates, trained and untrained, for nursing the sick in general and special hospitals throughout the country, and to offer suggestions for making the service more attractive to women suitable for this necessary work.'

The full and informative report still remains the most valuable authority on the subject, although the report of an official committee appointed by the Minister of Health, under the chairmanship of Lord Athlone, now occupies the field as the basis of official action.

It is impossible to examine in detail the proposals, as the work of nurses is a sufficiently important subject to deserve a separate article, but a salient distinction between the two reports may be noted, especially as it may be thought to arise to some extent from the large share of the Local Authorities in the hospital service of the country. The keynote of 'The Lancet' commission's report was to regard nursing as having a definite professional status. While the Athlone Committee adopt certain analogies with the teaching profession, their line of thought follows more nearly to trade union than to professional organisation. Steps being taken to implement the report may seriously prejudice the prospects of maintaining the standards of those who regarded nursing as a profession to be undertaken with a sense of vocation. While a nurse in training continues to receive a payment there will be ignorant criticism of 'sweated labour.' By all means let it be recognised that the services which she renders are a contribution to the cost of her training, but at the same time let nothing be done to confuse the fact that she is *in statu pupillari*. The sound analogy is with the student in the medical school, or even one who is in the massage or radiographic schools. The massage student in particular renders services which are of value to the patients and the hospital. Nevertheless she pays fees and does not receive her board and lodging. The nurse pays no fees and does not have to be maintained by her parents. Nevertheless under pressure from the Ministry of Health additional pay has been granted to the nurses in training. The financial prospects of the nurse before this war were more certain though not perhaps so large as those of the medical student. The Ministry of Health will have public support for proposals to remunerate the more responsible posts in the nursing profession so that they compare adequately with other professional occupations.

In the actual work of the hospitals two matters have attracted a good deal of attention, namely the treatment of fractures and of cancer.

The methods of dealing with fractures came into prominence owing to the large number resulting from accidents on the roads. The Voluntary Hospitals Commission in their final report in 1928 had agreed with the

view that the increasing frequency of motor accidents was placing a heavy burden on many hospitals. The statutory relief which they advocated by imposing a liability upon the motorist for a payment to the hospital when he had made one to the patient was granted after a few years' agitation by the hospitals. It naturally raised the question whether the hospitals were giving the best value for the money, and the British Medical Association aroused public opinion by issuing a report early in 1935 on the methods of dealing with fractures. This led to the appointment jointly by the Home Office, the Ministry of Health, and the Scottish Office of a strong committee to inquire into the arrangements in operation with a view to the restoration of the working capacity of persons injured by accidents. This covers all types of accidents, including those for which the workmen receive compensation costing at that time 13,000,000*l.* a year—an item which increases considerably under conditions of war. The proposals of the committee necessitated the constitution of centres with specialised staffs, medical, nursing, and lay, and equipment. All this involves additional expenditure, and it was not possible to provide a clear-cut scheme of the sources from which the funds to meet it would be derived. The Emergency Hospital Service has provided an opportunity to establish centres as recommended by the committee. The pathetic thing about this and other expenditure connected with hospitals is that so much of it is unnecessary. As the committee observe: 'the financial loss to the community resulting from injuries must be enormous.' The best way in which this loss can be diminished is by the prevention of accidents. If attacks from the air, which provide an appreciable proportion of fractures among the casualties, bring home to the general public the brutal wickedness of breaking up a human body for no reason at all, then perhaps the same line of thought may be applied to casualties on the road and in the factory. In this, as in other matters, especially some relating to the physical and mental wealth (in its true sense) of the community, there is need for a reorientation of public opinion.

While fractures are in the main avoidable, medical research has not yet quite reached the stage when the same can be said of cancer. In the meantime public concern

has demanded the national organisation of research and treatment which Parliament has authorised by collaboration between the authorities of local and voluntary hospitals. The war has partially suspended the operation of the Cancer Act, but at the same time may make its indirect contribution to this as to other departments of medical science. It may well be that the time is opportune for a more general acceptance of the propositions advanced by the medical author, who is obliged to adopt the pseudonym of 'John Cope,' in a volume dealing with the nature, causes, and prevention of cancer. His thesis is that the causes and nature of human cancer are far more likely to be revealed by a study of the habits and customs of human beings in all parts of the earth than by a study of the cancer cell. Even some of the orthodox, in spite of lack of success in research, are hopeful. It is refreshing to have the outlook of an optimist like 'James Harpole' on the subject, though it may be doubted whether leaves from a surgeon's case book are suitable for inclusion in a popular series such as the Guild Books. In fact the popularisation of disease was a contributory cause to the somewhat unhealthy state of mind generally prevalent before the war.

The psychological character of a great deal of the sickness of the people was demonstrated upon the declaration of war. Hospitals, specialists, and general practitioners found a drastic reduction in the number of patients. After an interval there was little evidence to show that they had suffered to any appreciable degree through cessation of medical attention. It was not, however, the hospitals which felt the first shock of war. It was Harley Street from which the majority of the occupants disappeared. This was mainly due to an arrangement made by the Deans of the Medical Schools of London to engage them in the emergency medical service. They were at once posted to hospitals within a region providing for the distribution of the population over the area served by the London Passenger Transport Board. There was a great deal of Press publicity about the financial distress among consultants. 'The Lancet,' in an article which aroused a certain amount of indignation, observed that 'before the war consulting medicine was slowly dying,' and included among the reasons that the London specialised

population was *grossly overcrowded*. It was admitted, however, that things were somewhat brighter in the provinces. In the early days of the war the interests of the consultants seem to have suffered from a confusion of committees, and there are signs that their position after the war may be prejudiced by the same cause. It is generally anticipated, however, that the consultants on the staff of the London voluntary hospitals will be unable to give their services to the same extent as in the past. The retainer paid by the London County Council to consultants is moderate but is a certainty. Some voluntary hospitals have allocated a percentage of the receipts from contributory associations. Unless the hospital receives the full cost of maintaining the patient this does not seem to be a logical or satisfactory arrangement.

There is some idea that a State Medical Service (without knowing very clearly what is meant) may solve this and a number of other problems, but even if that were acceptable to the medical profession as a whole, it is doubtful whether conditions created by the war will necessitate that development. War time has provided an interesting experiment by the pathologists in the establishment of a State service. At the outset the Ministry of Health seemed to give some encouragement. It was soon revealed, however, that the Ministry could not take direct responsibility and Local Authorities as well as voluntary hospitals were invited to resume a certain measure of control. An intermediate state of affairs now appears to remain, so that there may be a return to the *status quo ante bellum*, or a development in the opposite direction, according to circumstances.

So far as the voluntary hospitals are concerned there is a measure of justice which they might do to their staffs. One of the principal items in a consultant's budget is the cost of making provision for his future when he retires from active practice. He shares with other sections of the community this anxiety about his future. It should be one of the first aims of a post-war world to provide for the security in old age of the worker of every type. It should not be beyond the capacity of the voluntary hospitals to arrange a pension scheme to provide their honorary staffs with an annuity upon their retirement. Some adjustments would be necessary in the

case of men upon the staff of more than one hospital, but this and other details should not present any insuperable difficulty. The cost to the hospitals would be a serious item, but it is due to men whose services are essential to the continuance of the hospitals. Into the details of the changes which were made in the emergency medical service it is not necessary to enter now, but they demonstrated that on the whole the medical men concerned did not desire to retain whole-time employment, though a fixed retainer is welcome, especially if unaccompanied by any definite conditions of employment.

Decentralisation of the hospital service followed the declaration of war, though it was more marked in London than in other parts of the country. Aerial attacks have so damaged some of the hospitals that it has been necessary to re-establish them in outlying parts. Circumstances have compelled a somewhat haphazard choice. The problem presented by London still awaits solution. Much valuable information bearing upon the hospital position, as well as other aspects of it, was contained in the Report of the Royal Commission on the Distribution of the Industrial Population. By London may be meant one of several areas. There are the city and the county, though more generally, perhaps, people have in mind an area somewhat corresponding to that served by the Metropolitan Police. Comparatively few people have yet realised that London for defence purposes, and what affects them more, in the announcements of the B.B.C., is a much larger area. The hospital organisation for the convenience of transport roughly extended over the area of the London Passenger Transport Board. The Royal Commissioners described this area as 'the largest conurbation in existence' in this or any other country. They considered that 'the drift of the population to London and the Home Counties (Bedfordshire, Buckinghamshire, Essex, Hertfordshire, Kent, Middlesex, and Surrey) constitutes a social, economic, and strategical problem which demands immediate action.' The dispersal which has taken place during the war has carried out in some measure the desire of the Commissioners, though the returns from time to time have also demonstrated that there is an important psychological factor in the problem. London exercises a lure more unhealthy and more marked

than that of other large urban areas. The redistribution of industry is only a part of the problem, as the fundamental need is the return of a definite proportion of the population to the cultivation of the land. Until the location of the population is determined, whether under State direction or not, it is not possible to envisage the organisation of the hospital service. Many areas, especially around London, where there was an inadequate amount of hospital accommodation, now have beds within easy reach. The emergency hospital service has supplied the deficiencies for which the Local Authorities in law are responsible, though primarily they are due to the inability of voluntary hospitals to make the necessary extensions. Whatever may be the movements of the population, there are some guiding principles upon which it is desirable to establish the organisation of the hospital service.

The concentration of a number of hospitals in the centre of London has for years been indefensible. There must be amalgamation and redistribution. The union of voluntary hospitals in Plymouth, Birmingham, Liverpool, and other large cities has been effected, though the results have not yet shown any marked success. Hospital organisation requires strong centres, and as a general rule in each region there should be a hospital with a medical school. That will involve a reduction in the number in London and a wider distribution throughout the country. The teaching of medicine, however, would naturally be located where other branches of education receive efficient attention, so that there is some likelihood of establishing a university. In this as in other matters the hospital service cannot be divorced from other services, and, in particular, the means of transport. The removal of hospitals to outlying areas has, in theory, many points in its favour, but it is hard for the patients and their friends if the position is not readily accessible.

Regionalisation is receiving a certain amount of attention from voluntary hospital authorities under the stimulus of the Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, which was founded by Lord Nuffield, with a donation of one million share units in 'Morris' Motors, in the hope that through a regionalisation scheme may be evolved in course of time a truly national hospital service embracing all that is best of both public and voluntary effort, with

the maximum of economy to the State and to the private purse. Movements towards regionalisation are taking place in other departments of life. They involve a break-up of the ordinary areas of local government and the supersession of some of the authorities. It may be that the time has come for a further development along the lines of the Act of 1929 in creating larger areas. The Ministry of Health in the emergency service have followed the areas adopted throughout the country for defence purposes. It is possible that Local Authorities might be reconciled to a change of this kind if it did not involve their relinquishment of the general care of the public health, since it is essentially a service which can only operate favourably in conditions in which personal knowledge of the needs of the people and their manner of living are available. The Government appear to favour this view, as the terms of reference of the Post-War Reconstruction Committee dealing with the social services have the hospitals specially excepted from them.

It must be admitted, however, that the whole situation is likely to be affected considerably by the financial conditions. The effect of the emergency hospital service has been to place a larger portion of the cost of the hospitals upon the national exchequer and so to develop the movement which reached a further stage in the Local Government Act, 1929. But it can hardly be regarded as desirable that the Local Authorities should be relieved wholly of the responsibility for the welfare of the peoples resident in their areas. This accords with well-established principles of English government, and seems to be the basis upon which the Nuffield Trustees are proceeding in dealing with the hospital service. They have secured the consultative collaboration of the representative of the Local Authorities, and in some areas the regional councils are to be allowed to distribute moneys granted from the rates. There will still remain opportunity for State grants for those portions of the work that are of national importance to be administered on the lines of the University Grants Committee as suggested by the Cave Committee. The State can finance the work which benefits the community as a whole. In the hospitals that applies essentially to the educational work as distinct from the maintenance of patients, who generally are

drawn from a particular locality and thus are the responsibility of a Local Authority. Let the State then make its grants to the schools of medicine and dentistry, as it does now, and to those of nursing, physio-therapy, and radiography. In addition it can give grants to the hospitals in respect to the facilities provided for the students. In Scotland the medical student, in addition to his fees to the school, pays to the hospital a separate fee for walking the wards. Something of the same kind is in operation at Scottish radiographic schools. Here is the basis upon which the Exchequer can make a grant. Hospitals where there is teaching of special subjects, such as Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children, would have a natural place in the scheme. Both the Cave and Athlone Committees were in favour of schools of nursing being treated like other educational institutions.

The extent, however, to which aid may be required either from the rates or taxes depends in a considerable measure upon the amount of support available from voluntary sources. The State has undertaken to replace the considerable damage done by air-raid attacks, and it is quite probable that the present war will herald a new era in hospital building. The hutments provided by the Ministry of Health are far more attractive than those erected during 1914 to 1918. The patients like them and they are economical in working. Voluntary hospital committees have been erecting buildings at a cost of 1,000*l.* per bed, or even more. A hutment with accommodation for forty patients can be provided for less than three times that sum, though the cost of the additional land required has to be taken into account. Already the authorities of incompleting voluntary and council hospitals are realising that they will have to revise their ideas. So far as extensions and new buildings are required it is thought that it will be impossible to provide the necessary funds from voluntary sources, though the way in which money has been forthcoming in devastated Coventry does not support that view. For the maintenance the extension of contributory schemes will provide an increasing proportion of reliable income for the voluntary hospitals, though it must be accompanied definitely by instruction upon the place occupied by the hospital in the community. The propaganda of the contributory schemes

has undoubtedly contributed to an unhealthy state of mind in directing it to the hospital as the first resort in time of illness.

The first line of defence in the health services of the country, as the P.E.P. Report emphasised with admirable clarity of reasoning, is the general practitioner. Under the extension of the National Health Insurance scheme the proportion of the population with a direct and permanent relation to a general practitioner will be increased substantially. It is much to be hoped, however, that the Government committee which is overhauling the National Health Insurance will not hesitate to make drastic proposals, so that it may be worthy of its name instead of too often merely a subsidy for sickness. In 1940 no less a sum than 34,197,000*l.* was paid out in benefits. The sum lost in working days is even larger. As the P.E.P. Report observes :

' Excessive numbers of panel patients and excessive demands for certificates and returns of all kinds quickly reduce the general practitioner to an agent for making out prescriptions (too often for mere palliatives) and for operating something more like a sickness licensing and registration system than a health service ' (p. 397).

The general practitioner, in alliance with the health centres which are being established by the more progressive Local Authorities, may make an important contribution to a reduction in the hospital population, but even more may be done by the continuance of the work which has been inaugurated during the war to bring home to the people the conditions of healthy living. It has contributed towards the process of the reorientation of the health service to which the P.E.P. looked forward in their report. Then the hospitals will stand out even more clearly as great centres for the treatment of disease in its acute form, though diminished in quantity, and more particularly for that operative surgery necessary to remedy unavoidable defects in the human form. Even their authorities, nevertheless, may recognise that the nation's ideal for the people's health is to render the hospitals unnecessary rather than to plan for a never-ceasing extension of their accommodation.

C. E. A. BEDWELL.

Art. 9.—INDIAN POLITICS, 1940–41.

1. *Official Reports of Parliamentary Debates, Commons* April 22 and Aug. 1, 1941, Lords Aug. 5, 1941.
2. *The Asiatic Review (East India Association)*, January–October 1941.
3. *The Royal Central Asian Journal*, July 1941.
4. *The Choice before India*. By J. Chinna Durai, Barrister-at-Law. Jonathan Cape, 1941.
5. *Maulana Abul Kalam Azad—President of the Indian National Congress*. By Mahadev Desai; foreword by Mahatma Gandhi. George Allen and Unwin, 1941.
6. *Indian News Sheets for 1941*. By Sir Louis Stuart, C.I.E. Indian Empire Society.
7. *Nationhood for India*. By Lord Meston, K.C.S.I. Oxford University Press, 1931.
8. *India at War: A Record and a Review, 1939–40*. By Sir George Dunbar, with a foreword by Field Marshal Lord Birdwood, G.C.B. H.M. Stationery Office.

IN the January 'Quarterly' I traced the history of Mahatma Gandhi's 'civil disobedience' *alias* 'non-violent non-cooperative' campaigns between 1919 and 1940, and summarised the circumstances which preceded the 'individual' civil disobedience effort which, despite previous protestations of unwillingness to embarrass the Empire war-effort, he launched in November 1940. I will now explain more fully the latest quarrel between the Government and the Congress and will trace its course.

By the Government of India Act of 1935, it was declared that 'the prevention of any grave menace to the peace or tranquillity of India or any part thereof was the special responsibility of the Governor-General "who would exercise his individual judgment as to the action to be taken."' Emergency war measures have always lain within his sole competency. In August 1914 no one had disputed this. But much water had flowed under the bridges since then; and in September 1939 the 'All India National Congress,' a predominantly Hindu association with an Extremist Wing or 'Forward Block,' headed by Mr S. C. Bose, author of 'The Indian Struggle, 1920–34,' had held responsible office in eight of the eleven major provinces for two years. All the newly-elected

Congress members of Councils had taken an oath in March 1937 pledging themselves to work '*under the discipline of Congress*' to the end that India should be independent. The 'discipline' was administered by the Working Committee, a caucus of which Mr Gandhi was unofficially the chief adviser. The most important resolutions of this body were placed before a General Committee for approval which was usually accorded. Besides its dominant position in eight provinces, the Congress contributed the strongest particular section to the Imperial Legislative Assembly. On the outbreak of the war, Mr Gandhi told the Viceroy in an interview that just then he had no thought for India's political deliverance which would come but be worth little if England and France fell or emerged victorious but ruined and trampled. But he had no mandate to speak for the Congress, and after meeting the Working Committee he changed his mind and approved of a manifesto which expressed itself strongly against the totalitarian systems 'with their glorification of war and violence and suppression of the human spirit,' but objected to the declaration of India as a belligerent country and to the adoption of emergency war measures without India's consent. The issue of war or peace for India should not be decided 'by a foreign power.' A clear declaration was now required which would pledge the British Government to the ending of all imperialisms. Indians must frame a new constitution in supersession of the existing one. 'Full democracy' must be established by an India constituent assembly without British interference.

Constitutionally there was no ground for the alleged grievance; and in view of the widely published attitude of the Congress not only toward what they were pleased to call 'Imperialist Adventures,' but also toward the legislation which the Central Government had in September 1938 been compelled to introduce in order to stop an anti-recruiting campaign carried on mainly in the Punjab, 'the sword arm of India,' the Viceroy was obviously right in adhering to the Constitution. Speeches had a year before been made which Sir James Grigg, the Finance Member of the Viceroy's Council, had denounced as

'pointedly announcing to the world that in the next war India would not only not fight for the Empire but would

actively conspire to hinder and injure it. Of course,' he added, 'that India will do this is not true but it is not always obvious to outsiders that in the case of some members opposite, their eloquence goes even beyond their intentions.'

In September 1939, after receiving the Congress representation, the Viceroy invited fifty-two political and community leaders to meet him at Delhi. Rival views were expressed. The claim of the Congress to speak for India was then and afterwards emphatically repudiated by the Muslims, the Liberals and the Hindu Mahasabha (Orthodox Association) as well as by the ruling Chiefs. Lord Linlithgow announced his intention of calling together a consultative group in order to associate Indian opinion more closely with the war. On its conclusion Indians would be properly consulted in order to procure adjustment of views regarding the federation scheme. Mr. Jinnah, president of the Muslim League, expressed sympathy for France and England, but claimed that justice and fair play for Muslim minorities in Congress-ruled provinces must be secured if Muslim cooperation in the war was expected. The present Federation scheme implied an attempt to force Muslims into a constitution which 'permitted a permanent hostile (Hindu) majority to trample upon Muslim religious, political, and economic rights.'* After the meeting the 'Harijan,' Mahatma Gandhi's organ, regretted that the British had flung the minorities argument in the face of a credulous world. With his assent the 'Working Committee' ordered the Congress ministries in eight major provinces to resign. Under the provisions of the Act of 1935 the places of the outgoing ministers were temporarily filled by official 'advisers.' These arrangements were ratified by Parliament and proceeded smoothly in India.

In March 1940 the Congress met at Ramgarh (in Bihar) under a new president approved by Gandhi, Maulana Kalam Azad, a learned Muslim politician who, as his biographer, Mr Desai, the Hindu editor of the 'Harijan,' writes, had 'proclaimed himself a rebel' in the last war-period and then been interned. Now from the chair this man declared that the Indian fight was against British Imperialism as well as Nazism. Discussions

* January 'Quarterly,' p. 27.

closed with a resolution quoted in full by Desai. Congress, it stated, regarded the war as waged 'fundamentally for Imperialist ends' and disapproved of the constant drain of men and money from India. Nothing short of complete independence would be accepted by India. Dominion or any other status within the Imperialist structure was not in accordance with her dignity and would bind her to the British policies and economic structure. Her people alone could properly

'shape their own constitution and determine their relations to the other countries of the world through a Constituent Assembly *elected on the basis of adult suffrage*.* No permanent solution of the communal question was possible except through such an assemblage, nor could the rights of rulers of the Indian States or of foreign (i.e. British) vested interest be allowed to come in the way of freedom. The difficulty raised in regard to the ruling States was of British creation. The eight provincial Ministries had been withdrawn in order to dissociate India from the war and enforce the Congress determination to free the country from foreign domination. This preliminary step would be followed by civil disobedience which would be resorted to as soon as the Congress organisation was considered fit for the purpose, *or in case circumstances so shaped themselves as to precipitate a crisis*,* with the object of evoking "the spirit of sacrifice in the whole nation."

Mr Desai's book has very recently been published with a foreword from Mahatma Gandhi and has been introduced to the British public by a Mr H. G. Alexander, who is distressed that 'our government has, alas, drifted again into an open conflict with Indian Nationalism and that "many of India's noblest sons and daughters are in jail."' The Mahatma's foreword to the book draws our attention to the fact that the Maulana (a Muslim) is 'supreme head of the Indian National Congress.' Mr Gandhi is modest. The real head of the Congress is undoubtedly himself.

On June 8, after the battle of Flanders, the 'Harijan' called on its readers to observe the steady morale of the peoples of Great Britain and France. Britain would die 'hard and heroically' if she had to. Indians should not withdraw their bank deposits or hasten to turn paper into cash. They should go on with their work or business in

* My italics. The Assembly would of course be predominantly Hindu.

the usual manner. The Mahatma struck a high note. But a month later, after the collapse of France, his attitude changed. The 'Harijan' of July 6 contained a message to every Briton advising the abandonment of armed resistance, even if 'man, woman, and child' were slaughtered. Allegiance, indeed, should be refused to the enemy, but opposition should be restricted to civil disobedience which 'had not been without success in India.' Non-violence demanded 'universal love,' and Englishmen were assured of Mr Gandhi's affection which, indeed, had prompted this appeal. He was offering his services to the Home Government through the Viceroy, should they be considered of practical use in advancing its object. Mr Gandhi has his own ways of showing affection.

There had been, says Desai, a crisis in the Congress. The Mahatma had faced the Working Committee with a choice between non-violence and violence in the event of internal disturbance and external aggression.

'There may be a time,' he said, 'when the Congress would have to take charge of the administration. It is time that we made a declaration of our policy, especially when there is every danger of internal disturbances and anarchy and a possible danger of external invasion. We have sworn by non-violence as the only means for winning independence. We have now to declare that we shall retain independence by the same means.'

But here, to his 'painful surprise,' the others would not follow him. So he tactfully switched round and even encouraged the opposing idea that not only moral but violent cooperation should be offered if *independence was declared and a provisional National Government responsible not to the British Parliament but to the Indian Legislative Assembly was installed at the centre.*

'Whilst,' says Desai, 'he gave this advice and encouraged a resolution in terms of it, he was sore at heart and almost wished that Government might decline the offer, for he was sure that violent cooperation by India in the war would seal the fate of non-violence in the political and intellectual field for all time.'

The resolution was afterwards accepted by the General Committee. Nothing was said as to help for military operations outside India.

On Aug. 8, 1940, the Viceroy issued a declaration in which His Majesty's Government expressed sympathy with the idea that the framing of a new constitution should rest with Indians, but could not divest itself of responsibility for fulfilment of obligations which Britain's long connection with India had imposed on her, neither would they transfer their present responsibilities for the peace and welfare of the country to any system of government that was directly rejected by large and powerful elements in India's national life. Subject to these conditions, they were willing that such a constitution should be decided by a representative body based on agreement and should come into operation with the least possible delay after the war. Meanwhile they would promote in every way practical steps taken by representative Indians to reach agreement upon the form of the post-war representative body and upon the principles and outlines of the future constitution itself. They were anxious that, as an interim measure, the political leaders should be given the opportunity of more responsible association with the conduct of affairs during the war by expansion of the Viceroy's Executive and the formation of an all-India War Advisory Council. The hope was that Indian leaders should gain experience of the responsibilities of government, and in working together might acquire more understanding of each other and thus pave the way 'to the solution of those internal differences which are the real obstacles to India's constitutional progress.' *

The Congress rejected these proposals out of hand and returned to the absolute guidance of the Mahatma. It will be remembered that originally he had expressed his opinion that Constitutional reform should wait till the war was over, and had declared against any measure which could 'embarrass the Government when it was engaged in a life and death struggle.' Never before had this struggle been so sharp as now. Never had he been granted a better opportunity of rescuing his followers from a hopeless morass. What did he do? After some preliminary parleying with the Viceroy, he led them deeper down, flourishing the faded banner of civil disobedience. As he did not wish to embarrass the Government, it would

* Mr Amery, Secretary of State, 'Asiatic Review,' January 1941.

be 'individual.' Mr Amery told the Commons six months later (on April 22, 1941), that it was

'a curious campaign of Gandhi's own devising in pursuing which Congress leaders, ex-premiers, and ex-ministers, as well as members of the rank and file, made speeches which have been intended and calculated to interfere with the war effort. They have deliberately challenged fine and imprisonment with the same unquestioning obedience to the party whip as when they resigned office in the Provinces, and in many cases, I believe, the same misgiving and reluctance. The situation is naturally embarrassing, as, of course, it was meant to be. But, clearly, the Government cannot punish the ordinary offenders and overlook the same offences when committed by men whose position and whose course of action deliberately enhance the significance and political effect of the offence.'

At first the actors had been leading Congress personalities, then came members of provincial and local committees, and lastly the rank and file stage. Fines had been often imposed by magistrates without the option of imprisonment, procedure which had proved so discouraging to some whose chief inducement was the prospective election-eering advantage of a prison sentence that Mr Gandhi had announced that the payment of a fine would count equally as a meritorious sacrifice. Still the movement had proceeded languidly and without evoking much popular interest, except perhaps in the United Provinces, which had in recent months contributed more than half the offenders.

A paragraph in 'The Times' of July 31 carries the story further. Remarking that Congress enrolment has dwindled from less than 3,000,000 in 1939-40 to little more than 1,500,000 the writer adds :

'The decrease has been most marked where the Congress was strongest—the United Provinces: the decrease there in round figures was from 1,472,000 to 259,000. It is reported that in that part of India there has been a decline of interest in politics, more especially in the rural areas. Meanwhile the opposition of non-Congress organisations has been steadily developing.'

Prominent among these is the Muslim League. Mr Jinnah, its leader, fears that participation in an enlarged Governor-General's Executive Council would commit

Muslims to acceptance of a Central Government controlled by a Hindu majority. In the absence of general agreement the scheme of August 8 was temporarily shelved, but the door was left open for reconsideration by those immediately concerned.

Hindu Muslim antagonism is discussed in Mr Chinna Durai's frank and courageous 'The Choice before India.' He is an Indian Christian Nationalist, whom 'the hard knocks of reality have converted from unreasoning to sober Nationalism,' and he has written to turn his countrymen 'from the backward and impracticable path set to them by the Congress.' At the moment of his writing,

'Britain is still anticipating invasion from Germany, and German bombers are overhead dropping bombs to right and left of me. I might never have survived to finish this book had not British fighters, Hurricanes and Spitfires, shot down German fighters and bombers at the rate of one a minute. When stark realities such as this face so powerful a country as Britain, Congress' demand for complete independence and Gandhi's plea for the clock to be put back in India that she may revert to the days of bows and arrows is farcical. . . . The grim choice now before India is life or death, and my endeavour is to show that it is only by choosing Dominion status and remaining as a partner in the British Commonwealth of Nations that India can save herself from disintegration with the fair prospect of usefulness in regard to herself and the world.'

The weighty indictment which he brings against the Congress may best be summarised in his sentence: 'The world best knows what poor prospects India has of survival under such appalling leadership of men who cannot rise to the occasion or see beyond their noses.' Happily India's destiny is not in such hands.

Durai dismisses the Congress contention that Hindu-Muslim antagonism is due to the British policy of *Divide et impera*, and especially to the prevailing system of communal representation under which Muslim voters are placed on a separate electoral roll and choose their own representatives. 'In fact,' he says, 'the separation reduces the chance of conflict as rival communities are not battling against each other for the same seat.' The case for it was admirably put forward by Lord Morley in Parliament on Feb. 23, 1909:

'Some may be shocked at the idea of a religious register at all, a register based on the principle of religious belief. We may wish—we do wish—that it were otherwise. We hope that time with careful and impartial statesmanship will make things otherwise. Only let us not forget that the difference between Muhammadanism and Hinduism is not a mere difference of religious faith or dogma. It is a difference in life, in tradition, in history, in all the social things as well as articles of belief, that constitute a community.' *

I was in India then and do not doubt that but for the concession the consent of the newly-formed Muslim League to the Morley-Minto reforms which, they saw, were extremely likely to lead to the establishment of a Parliamentary system of governing by majority votes, would not have been obtained. Subsequent Reformers have felt constrained to follow the same line. But events have mocked at Morley's hope that time would heal the breach between the two main communities of India. It now gapes so widely that the President of the Muslim League, which is certainly the chief representative of Muslim political opinion, declares that Hindus and Indian Muslims are two nations 'and that democratic systems, based on the concept of a homogeneous nation such as England, are definitely not suited to a heterogeneous nation such as India.' In December 1916, when President of the Lucknow meetings of the League, Mr Jinnah spoke very differently and afterwards he joined the Congress and was hailed by a Congress poetess as 'ambassador of Hindu-Muslim unity.' † But further experiences, especially experience of Congress in office, have altered his views. 'The Times' of March 27, 1940, contains a letter from its special correspondent headed 'Moslem India on Guard. Dangers of Hindu Democracy,' which describes the position. By the first elections under the new Constitution the Congress party secured control of eight of the eleven (major) provinces. This unexpected accession to power warped the judgment of Congress leaders. Believing that its success at the polls justified its claim to represent all India, the Congress proceeded to launch a mass campaign in the hope of enticing the Moslem

* 'Indian Speeches,' p. 127.

† 'Jawahirlal Nehru,' p. 67.

masses into the Congress fold. The belief emerged that the Congress party was trying to cause divisions among the Moslems with the object of impressing the world that the Congress party was the sole representative of politically-minded India. The Congress policy gave new life to the Moslem League whose members rallied with such enthusiasm behind their leader, Mr Jinnah, that he was virtually given a blank cheque on its behalf. The League quickly became the focussing point on an all-India scale for Moslem political opinion. It is held by some that the younger educated Moslems of to-day disagree with League policy. But support for it has lately been developed for political reasons, particularly since the Congress leaders demanded a declaration of independence. The majority of politically-minded Muhammadans support the League, not necessarily by membership, and no existing Muslim party is strong enough to supplant it. The League does not recognise the authority either of the British Government or of the Congress party to determine the future constitutional position of the Muslim community, and it rejects any proposal for a constitutional solution along lines implying the supremacy of the Hindu majority. As the 'Civil and Military Gazette' recently remarked :

'Mr Jinnah's arguments against the democratic form of government in India are obviously based on a conviction that Hindus, as a result of centuries of observance of caste, cannot act democratically in politics.'

Sir Harry Haig, lately Governor of the United Provinces, told the East India Association last year * that

'had the Congress on assuming office invited the cooperation of the Muslim League, this dangerous antagonism between the two communities need perhaps never have developed. But as time went on the Muslims became more and more convinced that it was the intention of the Congress party to constitute themselves the sole inheritors of British power, and by the use of a permanent Hindu majority to become the effective rulers of the country.'

Further on he said, 'grave communal riots have been of unprecedented frequency.'

* 'Asiatic Review,' July 1940.

On Aug. 1, 1941, the gravity of these communal riots was emphasised by Sir Stanley Reed in the Commons; and on August 5 Lord Hailey said in the Upper House that the rioting that had taken place in Bombay and elsewhere had 'prompted one of the most independent of India's papers to demand something like a return to strong government.' It is reported* that Mr Gandhi has stated that Congress influence had been practically unfelt during those dark days. 'It is negligible in riots and the like.' 'If the Congress has no control over the masses on such occasions there is not much value in Congress non-violence as a positive force. The Congress cannot take charge of Government if the British suddenly withdraw.' 'The power will descend on those who are able to make effective use of violence.' But he has also said 'What should a Congressman do? He must resolutely refuse to take sides, and defend with his life and without the use of violence the person who is in distress.'

Mr Gandhi's obedient followers must be sadly perplexed.

The Hindu-Muslim contest for power is watched with eager interest by the turbulent tribes on the North-West frontier. So far their sympathies are apparently with us in the war. On May 8 Mohmands and on May 10 Afridis telegraphed strong protests to Raschid Ali Gillani, our adversary in Irak. But the Pakistan (pure country) plan which has lately emerged and would split India into independent Hindu and Muslim blocks may work serious mischief. To one who remembers the old days it seems impossible that so dangerous a proposal should be seriously meant. But, as Burke said, 'Temper and policy go ill together.'

The Indian States with their princes or rulers are regarded by the Congress leaders as an obstacle to their plans which must be removed. Agitations in these States have been for some time fomented from British India. I give only one out of many instances. At Ludhiana in the Punjab not long before the war, Pandit Jawahirlal Nehru presiding over a conference of States subjects denounced the States system in bitter terms. 'Some,' he said, 'have had competent rulers or ministers, but the majority were

* In the 'National Herald' (Lucknow) of May 8.

"sinks of reaction and incompetence." But whether the rulers were good or bad, competent or incompetent, the system had vanished from the world. In spite of its manifest decay and stagnation it has been propped up and artificially maintained by British Imperialism. . . . Therefore when the conflict comes we must recognise who our opponent is.' * It is not surprising that thus menaced, the peace of their States threatened by seditious agitations, the princes strongly object to closer connection with Provinces that may be ruled by Ministries composed of their open foes. Whether their States are of later or of earlier origin they represent the centuries-old ruling system of India, beside which the Congress and democracy are innovations of yesterday.

The ordinary Hindu mind is extremely conservative and moulded by the caste system. 'In mystical India the deities hover and swarm'; and to gaze with reverence on the auspicious countenance of a Maharaja brings good luck. Mr J. A. Spender in his 'Men and Things' (pp. 145-6) gives us some notes recorded in 1911 of his impressions at the Delhi Coronation Durbar.

'The reception of the King Emperor exceeds all the expectations of the official world and had no analogy in Western experience. One sees it as an uprush from the sub-conscious mind of India, the desire for a sovereign, slumbering for centuries but awakened to life by this event. Malecontents and critics are swept into line by it and give to the King Emperor what they deny to the Government. For in his person India becomes one country under one lord and exalts itself while it deifies the King. The impulse is unusual and people seem to be celebrating not a Royal visit, but a Restoration, or the recovery of some ancient and long lost symbol of religion. The thing pulls you up short, if you have thought about the masses of India in terms of Western democracy.'

The writer adds:

'This is a truthful record set down at the time twenty years ago. Whether in the subsequent years there has been any change in the sentiment of the Indian masses is more than I can say. But I believe that it would be a great mistake to undervalue the part that falls to the King Emperor in any constitution for India.'

* Quoted in 'India under the Congress' by Sir Michael O'Dwyer, 'National Review,' July 1939.

To the princes and ruling chiefs we are bound not only by written treaties, but by every tie of honour. Their steadfast loyalty and generosity have meant much to us in the last great war and mean much to us now.

Another section of the population of India which has no desire for Congress rule is that of the 50 or 60 millions of outcastes claimed by caste Hindus as their co-religionists for the purpose of the ballot-box, but otherwise treated as untouchable serfs. Their particular grievance was mentioned by Sir William Barton (I.C.S. retired) in a paper narrating his impressions of the 'Indian Political Scene on a Recent Visit' read before a meeting of the East India Association on July 3, with the President, the late Lord Willingdon, in the Chair.* For the better protection of the depressed classes in provinces governed under a parliamentary system the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald, gave them separate electorates in his communal award. But their exclusion from the Hindu purview drove Mr Gandhi into a frenzy. In protest he staged a fast to death, and such was the resultant moral pressure on both outcastes and Hindus that the outcaste leaders were induced to accept a few more seats from the Hindu quota on condition that outcastes would have their own representatives; but these would be chosen by joint electorates of outcastes and caste Hindus. The consequence was that 90 per cent. of outcaste members have been elected on the Congress ticket and contributed toward the Congress success at the polls. As a community the outcastes have not benefited under Congress rule in certain provinces. Sir William says that they have been consistently ignored and are now determined to have their separate electorate restored.

The Hindu Mahasabha or great assemblage does not pretend to be National, and stands frankly for Hindu rule based on preponderance of numbers. It supports the war effort. There are other minor Hindu and Muslim parties; there are the Indian Christians and finally there are the Moderates, the National Liberals, to whom Durai belongs, and whom he regards as destined to be the pre-dominating central party of the future. He tells us that

* 'Asiatic Review,' October 1941.

they limit their ambitions to the attainment of Dominion status, for this will ensure

'complete internal independence while securing at the same time the invaluable aid of Britain in the matter of defence, which is no mean advantage to a country that stands in eternal danger of being attacked and subjugated.'

On his pp. 111-12 he accounts for the defeats of the Moderates in the 1937 elections :

'If there are two candidates standing for a particular constituency the Congress volunteers approach the voters and make sure of them. It is a case of first come first served with the Indian voters; and the Congress certainly does understand their peculiar mentality, and makes good use of its knowledge. In some cases money speaks more eloquently than words in influencing the voters. Here the Congress has definite advantages over the Moderates as it seems to have some wealth tucked away somewhere the source of which has baffled many an Indian. After all, what can you expect of the Indian voters, the majority of whom cannot write their own names or read the names of the candidates when called upon to make the choice?'

On his p. 176 he says that the success which the Congress obtained in the last general elections is not a proof of its popularity, but of the ignorance and illiteracy of the masses of India, the general apathy of the voters who do not trouble to go to the polls, 'the indifference of the Moderates as far as propaganda goes,' and the power of the Congress machinery. But he thinks that in view of the disappointment felt by the electors at the achievements of the Congress in office and its failure to carry out its extravagant promises, it is unlikely to repeat its initial success.

Is he sure? He has practically admitted that the Moderates from lack of cohesion, organisation, and self-sacrifice have failed to play the big part which he assigns to them in his vision of the future. On August 5, speaking on the second reading of the India and Burma Postponement of Elections Bill, Lord Hailey, who had, 'so far as officials may,' taken a somewhat prominent part in supporting the legislation of 1935, told the Upper House that then he and others had believed that there was in India

' a great body of Moderate opinion sufficiently strong to form a central party, a party which would place the needs of stable government above other considerations and that this body of moderate opinion would have the courage and good sense to support its own position . . . that it would secure for us breathing space and opportunity for considering the lines considered most appropriate by India herself for her own constitution. Our forecast was wrong. The Moderate party existed. There were solid elements among landowners and commercial men, and the Indian Liberal Party, but they had not the cohesion or the courage, he said this with regret, to withstand an attack that was made partly in the interest of one religious party and partly by a spirit of racial and anti-British attack. They had not the strength to combine and withstand that attack and they were set aside.'

Yet, he added, there were solid reasons for renewed hopes.

' Events themselves were teaching India a lesson that it would never learn from us. It is beginning to learn that no Constitution with Liberal tendencies, no Constitution that points toward responsible government, can operate successfully in the face of an overwhelming party spirit, cannot operate successfully unless there are those who will support it with courage and strong civic sense, and it will not operate successfully unless the majority can learn the lesson of tolerance toward minorities. . . . We felt further that there were in the events of the war itself lessons that would bring home to India a sense of greater realism. After all this is the first time that India has felt danger at her doors.'

The danger at India's doors is coming nearer now.

A scheme for breaking the constitutional 'impasse' by establishing a National Government at the centre responsible to the Crown through the Viceroy, thus short-circuiting Parliament and Whitehall, was in March last proposed by a strong group of Indian Liberals. During the war this Government while directing all departments would, as its principal duty, deal with all important matters of policy on the basis of joint collective responsibility.

Its members would be 'non-official Indians selected by the Viceroy and drawn 'from important elements in the public life of this country.' It would control finance and defence, although 'the position of the Commander-

in-Chief as the Executive head of the forces of the country would not be in any way prejudiced. A specified time limit should also be fixed for the introduction of Dominion status. The suggestions were rejected by the Secretary of State for good and obvious reasons.* The leader of the Muslim League denounced the scheme as a trap into which its principal promoter, Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru, P.C., had been led by Congress wire-pullers. Mr Amery advised the Liberal leaders to concentrate first and foremost upon bringing the contending elements in India together either by exercising persuasion on the existing party leaders or by building up a strong central party.

The Commander-in-Chief, Sir Archibald Wavell, following up the initiative taken by his predecessor, Sir Claud Auchinleck, has lately announced that a Defence committee of the Legislature would assist in the work of keeping the public and the Press in touch with the work of the Defence Department, and that an Indian official was being appointed joint-secretary in that Department. On July 22 Mr Amery announced in Parliament that in order to meet the increased pressure of work due to the war, the Governor-General's Executive Council would be enlarged and a new Advisory National Defence Committee would be established consisting of about thirty members. On August 1 he explained these changes further. The Viceroy had patiently but vainly tried to bring the chief party leaders together. Evidence of rising public impatience with the resulting stalemate had accumulated. The menace of war might well draw near to the Indian frontier both from the West and East within the next few months. The Viceroy had therefore addressed himself to prominent and respected Indian public men and asked them to come forward and play their part in the conduct of India's defence. Almost without exception his invitations were welcomed without regard to previous party affiliations. The Viceroy's Executive Council, which had till now included four British and three Indians, apart from the Viceroy, would now include four British and eight Indians. The change was 'not perhaps in the form but at any rate in the spirit of our Indian administration.' The new National Defence Council would be entirely

* See 'Hansard,' April 22, 1941, pp. 56-58.

Indian in its composition, excepting only in the presence of one representative of the European commercial community and another of the resident Anglo-Indian community. As some of the nominations which he instanced showed, the Council would be by no means a body of 'yes men.' The scheme was discussed and approved. It came before the Lords on August 5 and met with general good will there also. A few criticisms were passed in both Houses. Their value will be tested by experience. The changes should stimulate a spirit of neighbourliness in India. Lord Hailey said on August 5 that much credit was due to the Provincial Governments for maintaining all the essentials of law and order in difficult circumstances 'in spite of a great deal of opposition from certain quarters.' No one can speak on Indian subjects with his long experience of high and responsible offices in the country.

The 'Round Table' issue for June contains a thoughtful and valuable article on 'Post-War India' in which it is pointed out that even the most powerful States in the world and those best equipped with human and natural resources are no longer able to achieve security alone. Neither the British Empire nor the United States are safe without each other's help. With her immense population (now risen to 400 millions), India has far indeed to go before she can be in any sense self-dependent and simultaneously able to raise her general standard of living. She must be united, for disunion would wreck the prospect of that industrial development on which her life depends. Broken up too she would be incapable of defence against the outside world.

To us in England as we survey present perils one of the most cheering thoughts is the willing and splendid help we have been receiving from India in men, munitions, and generous gifts. The 'battle of Britain' last year, the gallant self-sacrificing spirit of our young airmen touched the hearts and the chivalry of many there. Sir George Dunbar's 'India at War' shows the assistance she is giving us in the great fight for religion, honour, and civilisation. The map therein shows that her frontiers for defence purposes now stretch west and east far over the seas where they are guarded by the White Ensign.

Both in Britain and India the loss of Lord Willingdon is widely mourned. His last public speech at the July

meeting of the East India Association * testified to his deep concern for India's welfare. He was anxious to break down Hindu and Muslim differences as he felt very strongly 'the magnificent work that our Indian people are doing at this critical time.' Another matter lay 'very near his mind.' It was a pity that so much effort had been made to pacify Mr Gandhi and the Congress party 'for such action creates a very bad impression on the other communities in India.' He has gone; but his influence and example remain to help us.

VERNEY LOVETT.

* 'Asiatic Review,' October 1941.

Art. 10.—THE CHURCH AND THE OUTLOOK.

1. *Faith for Living*. By Lewis Mumford. Secker and Warburg, 1941.
2. *Contemporary English Theology*. By Walter Marshall Horton. S.C.M., 1940.
3. *Yeoman Calling*. By Christopher Turnor. W. and R. Chambers, 1939.
4. *The Future in Education*. By Sir Richard Livingstone. Cambridge, 1941.

THE title of this article may seem to suggest a certain temerity, seeing that the future before our country, and the conditions which will prevail at the end of the war, are so largely unpredictable. There are, however, certain broad affirmations which even in present circumstances may be reasonably made; among them is the belief that, whatever fortune may betide, the main sinews in the Church's life to-day will not be less important than they are now, and will probably be more so. We cannot forecast future events; but we can discuss movements and tendencies of thought, interest and action within the Church itself which suggest how the organism is developing and adapting itself already to its ever-changing environment. Short of some overwhelming catastrophe, these developments look robust enough to make good. Much will hang on them. English history does not suggest that the years following an exhausting war will provide a very fruitful soil for revolutionary change. Our countrymen are at heart a domestic and peace-loving people, to whom home ties and local interests make the first appeal, and who are aware that political strife rarely serves either; their dominant desire, when the present ferment and conflict have subsided, is likely to be the hope to develop these ties and interests unmolested. The writers of the Old Testament pictured peace as a state when every man should sit 'under his vine and under his fig-tree.' The picture is idyllic; but it represents the cherished and permanent ideals of personal liberty and personal security. In a highly organised society like our own these ideals are found most fully expressed in a whole network of institutions, loyalties, and voluntary associations. It is to them, we may conjecture, rather than to large scale reconstruc-

tion by the State, that the average man will pin his hopes, and to them that he will look for the satisfactions that he seeks. And among these is the Church.*

Far the greatest contribution which the Church has to make to the nation is its faith, and the quality of life, the consecration, which derives from it. To maintain and teach the faith, to build up the faithful in the worship and fear of God, to draw in the indifferent and the lapsed, to initiate and support all possible steps for the succour of the afflicted and the removal of obstacles to the good life—these are its primary tasks. Its *raison d'être* is to bear witness to a divine revelation, and to be the channel of the divine grace. It claims to have received, and to be charged to impart, the most important and most practical of all kinds of truth, the truth about the spiritual origin, nature, and destiny of man, and his relationship to God and to the world. This kind of truth will be in vital demand after the war no less than now; for it deals with man as a whole. As Mr Mumford has pointed out in 'A Faith for Living,' the various forms of totalitarianism which at present dehumanise men—or at least sub-humanise them—are simply political expressions of the growing dominance of the machine over life and thought, which had been a marked feature of 'progress' and 'civilisation' for a long time past. (The history of the process is recorded in one of Mr Mumford's earlier works 'Technics and Civilisation.') The present crisis, moreover, arises in his judgment as much from the feebleness and superficiality of the good as from the covetousness, malice, and brutality of the wicked. The good had plenty of optimism but little faith, and they have no right to be surprised if they now discover that their good intentions have been used to pave a veritable hell. Only a faith which reasserts man's spiritual nature will be strong enough to withstand the down-drag of the machine; and

* Some would speak of 'the Churches' rather than the Church. But the singular is used here for two reasons. One is that the plural disguises the underlying unity in which I believe all Christian people are held together, and into which they are baptized, making them one flock though not one fold. The other is that the Church of England is still in a special sense the Church of the nation, numerically and sentimentally no less than historically and constitutionally. Nor am I competent to speak of the Roman Catholic Church or the Free Churches from inside knowledge; though much of what is said here may be applicable to them also.

prominent in this re-assertion will be the recognition of what our forefathers called 'original sin.' That is part and parcel of any doctrine of man which is to assert his dignity while recognising his misery. Its formulation is difficult, and has varied at different times. But the fact that man feels called to rise above himself, and yet so constantly falls below himself, and indeed even below the beasts, is too widely and too poignantly brought home by experience to be any longer given a secondary place.

Christianity takes note of this deep-seated disharmony between God and man, and therefore sets the Cross, which is the means of reconciliation, at the very heart of its faith, its worship, and its way of life. What the Gospels show us is Christ as the Power and the Wisdom of God; the Power of God, dealing victoriously with sin, with suffering, and with death,* as well as the Wisdom of God, revealing the will of the Father and the heart of man; and it is because He is both Power and Wisdom that He becomes our 'righteousness.' Father Tyrrell, in one of the most powerful of his books, summed up the true Christian outlook on the world as consisting in a 'proximate pessimism' combined with an 'ultimate optimism,' and he traced this to the New Testament and the teaching of Christ. The definition could not easily be improved upon; and it corresponds well to a religion which has at its centre the two facts of Crucifixion and Resurrection. But how far has the Church, in the interval between the two wars, been faithful to this Gospel? The issue is of crucial importance, both for the Church's inner life and for its influence in public affairs. To take the second point first: can it be denied that among Church-people, leaders and rank-and-file alike, there has been far too great a readiness to endorse the popular optimisms of the moment, and to abandon—or at least to keep in cold storage—those cautions and criticisms which our forefathers, with their more theological and therefore more realistic understanding of human nature, had devised and handed down? Thus, in social development at home the extravagant promises of an earthly paradise which have been so often dangled before the public mind have been frequently endorsed as though they were an integral part of the

* The point is well brought out in 'The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels' by the Rev. Alan Richardson.

Christian philosophy ; while in international affairs the plain dictates of national security were set aside, as though law and peace could be defended by pieces of paper and there were no robbers in the field. The truth is that the Christian world, not least in England and America, forgot original sin. We shall be without excuse if we forget it again.

A similar weakness has beset the Church's inner life. All too often the parson, having begun by mistaking the optimism of the world for a form of the Christian faith, ends by preaching politics on Sunday. There is no surer way for the salt to lose its savour. The general standard of public work among the clergy to-day is probably as high as it ever was ; but there has been an immense loss of spiritual power in the Church through forgetfulness of its essential functions—that of bearing witness to the supernatural order and being the channel of supernatural grace. Probably more members of the Church of England turn to the Roman Church for this reason than for any other. The laity neither want, nor need, to hear on Sunday the parson's version of what has already appeared in the newspapers : what they want and need to hear from him is what he is specially trained and commissioned to give, God's message to their hearts. But he cannot give it unless the Church as a whole is providing the right climate for its teaching office to flourish in, a climate in which theology is recognised and honoured as the highest pursuit of man's mind. It is often reckoned to be a good thing that the Church is not now racked by the acute theological controversies of the last century ; and so in one way it is, for these controversies were the occasion of forms of persecution which embittered the Church's life and gave rise to dangerous partisanship. But it would be a mistake to suppose that controversy in itself is an evil ; in every age, indeed, it has called out some of the best theological thought and writing. One of the most encouraging features of the Church to-day is the decay of partisanship and the brotherly way in which clergy of different schools of thought work and pray together. But the last thing we should desire is that those schools of thought themselves should cease to be. As between the Catholic and the Protestant types of thought and piety there are differences of emphasis but the same faith, the one laying

especial stress on the Sacraments and the other on the Word ; and the comprehensiveness of the Church of England consists in the free swing of the pendulum between these two. Partisanship represents the attempt to hold the pendulum fixed at one end or the other of its swing.* Perhaps the chief work of the liberal school in the Church is to see that fixation never takes place. For while the two schools of thought are in tension, men are forced to think out their own position, and to try to get to the root of the issues which divide them from their neighbours ; and these issues they find more complex than they had supposed.

Our Lord spoke of His Church as ' the salt of the earth ' and ' the light of the world ' ; and if it is to do its work the salt must not lose its savour nor must the light be muffled. The warning has peculiar force in a country where the Church has been for centuries an established institution. For a nation cannot live on diffused Christianity alone. The process of disintegration is cumulative. Men begin by reckoning that the ' first and great commandment,' which is concerned with the love and worship of God, can be dropped, provided that adequate weight is given to the second, our duty to our neighbour. Next, this too is allowed to lose all definiteness of outline, and the requirements of Christianity are reckoned to be satisfied by a vague humanitarianism tinged more or less with religious emotion. So we reach the stage where a society is content to live on the spiritual capital it has received from the past. The remedy can only come through a revival of the teaching office of the Church. The *knowledge* of God to which St Paul recurs again and again as part of the necessary equipment of the average Christian is not something that can be picked up in passing : it depends upon instruction. The leading and honourable part which the Church has played in the history of national education springs from its recognition of that fact. And this instruction, in turn, depends upon dogma. Dogma is a term which Englishmen as a whole, including many Church-people, do not understand, and therefore tend to dislike.

* Compare an article by the Rev. F. C. Syngé in ' Theology,' November 1940.

But there are signs of a change. As long as fifteen years ago a series of conferences between English and German theologians, promoted by the Bishop of Chichester, revealed a striking desire in the Protestant churches of Germany for a return from the stubble-fields of criticism to the rich granaries of the Gospel and the standing corn of a living doctrinal theology; while in this country a number of Nonconformist divines have been in the forefront of a similar movement. So far as the Church of England is concerned, the works of Bishop Gore commanded throughout his lifetime an immense sale in all parts of the world. More recently the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Christian Doctrine was an attempt to explain and re-interpret the creed of Christendom in the light of modern knowledge, and to show how wide a room it opened to the Christian intellect. Movements of this kind have always to cope with a back-wash of unenlightened emotion and prejudice; but they are not likely to recede. The study of the New Testament has been shifting from the exploitation of literary discrepancies to the discovery of the underlying unities of thought and teaching; and the outline of the original Gospel with which the primitive Church went into the world has come to stand out increasingly fixed and clear. So far as the public is concerned, moreover, growing familiarity with technical terms in every branch of social and industrial life has combined with a sense of mental and moral confusion in spiritual matters to create a deep-seated demand for religious teaching which shall be clear, coherent, and authoritative.

'If the salt hath lost its savour'—the task of the clergy is not only to teach the people and to lead them in worship; it is also to care for them as Christ's flock. How far is the Church properly equipped and organised to-day for its pastoral work? The question is of extreme intricacy, and for that reason admits of no summary answer: there is hardly any field where we need to be more on our guard against pulling up the wheat with the tares than that of administrative reform in the Church. It is not merely that there is so much that is good; more important still is the far-reaching danger of switching the attention of priest and people alike from the Church's primary task of

spiritual work and witness to the business of 'serving tables' and putting its house in order. Let us look first at the wheat.

The strength of the parochial system, as war conditions have shown, lies in the allocation of residential clergy to definite communities and geographical areas as the spheres of their pastoral care, and in the tradition, which goes with this, that every parishioner has a claim on the attention of his parson. The organisation, that is to say, is that of a settled rather than a missionary Church. The distinction is important, even though modern conditions have tended in certain respects to blur it. But we can see the difference clearly enough in the country. Let a new parson go to a country parish and give the impression that he has a *mission* to its people, and he will quickly find himself suspect; but he can say as much as he will about his *ministry* to them and, if he follows it up in deed, he will be welcome in every house.

At the same time, a settled Church does not mean a Church incapable of moving with the times, and the parochial system, which looks so muscle-bound, has shown itself to be elastic and supple in time of need. All promoters of Church reform need to have in mind not only the Church's settled character, but also the steps which have been, and are being, taken to adjust it to new conditions. The legislative record of the Church Assembly, during the twenty years of its life, would do credit to any representative body; the improvement of the Church's financial methods, the establishment of pensions for the clergy and their dependants, the introduction of a proper system of dilapidations for parsonage houses, are only a fraction of the story. Only a few months before the outbreak of war, The Clergy (National Emergency Precautions) Measure invested the Bishops with wide powers to do those very things—grouping parishes, re-distributing endowment incomes, closing churches, moving clergy—which experience has shown to be vitally necessary if parishes are to be properly cared for, and services provided, in areas most afflicted by the exigencies of our time. Though the operation of this Measure is limited at present to five years, lessons of great value may be learnt from it for future and wider use; the fact that the Assembly passed it by an almost unanimous vote in each of its three

Houses shows that resource and foresight are not wanting to a settled Church.

It is along these liberal and enabling lines rather than by bureaucratic and centralising methods, by using existing powers and where necessary extending them rather than by imposing sweeping policies, that we may expect progress to be made. The problems of the recruitment and use of man-power for the Ministry will be pressing : of its recruitment, because we must concentrate on quality not quantity, and aim at better, if fewer, men ; and of its use, because Church-people increasingly feel that the proportion of the clergy who are absorbed by small country parishes is far too large, when regard is had to the understaffed parishes and overworked clergy in the more populous areas. The first task will devolve primarily upon the Bishops, though it can be much facilitated by the way in which the second is tackled ; for the best men will be attracted to the Ministry only if they know that its work will tax their full energies for a lifetime. The second task is one of great complication, involving numerous interests, and must therefore be tackled slowly.

No more can be attempted here than the outline of an approach to the problem. We must begin at the country end, not only because it is there that reorganisation must first take place if men are to be available for the cities, but also because it is there that the system presses most hardily on the spiritual life of the clergy. They have no large congregations to inspire them, even though the proportion of the parishioners in church on Sunday may be quite as large as in the towns. They have no colleagues in their parishes, so that loneliness is common ; the small population to which each ministers offers no ' fresh woods and pastures new,' to compensate for the indifference or the rejection which is so often their lot amongst their own people. Hitherto the administrative step most often resorted to for meeting some of the country parsons' difficulties has been the union of benefices ; but, apart from the fact that a living wage is thus secured, the spiritual problems are not faced : indeed, while a man's work may be doubled, his effectiveness for it may be halved. Thoughtful people are therefore turning more and more to *grouping* of benefices rather than union for a solution. Let us assume, for instance, that the Church

may be able to provide on the average five clergy for every eight existing rural parishes. How shall we best use them? If they reside at one centre, seven parishes will be without a resident parson; while if they live in five different places *without further measures being taken*, the flaws in the present system still persist. There must, therefore, be coordination, and coordination means differentiation of status under a common rule. The classification of the parochial clergy into incumbents and curates has been aptly compared to that of a regiment which had only colonels and subalterns: we need a far more varied arrangement. In the titles of 'rector' or 'vicar' we have old and honoured names which might be used in this connection. If the head of the group were called Rector, and the staff consisted of two Vicars and two assistant curates, and if their life and work were governed by statutes like those of a cathedral or college, we might hope to strengthen the effectiveness of each without losing the value of the parochial system. The Rector would be chosen for his general pastoral and administrative qualities, and, not least, for his gifts as a trainer of men; for the country is a better training ground than the town for a man in the early days of his ministry, and it is to be hoped that every man might expect to do three or four years there. The Vicars (who would not have freeholds) would be men of special rather than general gifts: education, Church music, and knowledge of the social and legal machinery which controls so much of men's life to-day, cry aloud for the specialist priest. Further, though the men would live in four or five different places, they would not always preach where they lived, so that the staleness which so often afflicts both parson and congregation to-day, when they meet at every Sunday service, would be largely overcome. When five men could not cover the ground adequately, an admirable opening would be given for the ministry of deaconesses: they should be regarded as being, both ministerially and for purposes of the use of the endowment income, 'on the strength' of the grouped parishes.

Schemes of grouping are not impossible even under the existing law: they have been tried intermittently here and there during the last thirty years. Moreover, recent legislation by the Church Assembly has already prepared

the way for further developments, and there seems no reason why patrons, parochial Church Councils, and Parliament should not look on them favourably. Very differently conceived, however, is the series of proposals originally put forward in a pamphlet called 'Men, Money, and the Ministry,' and now available in a revised version under the title of 'Putting our House in Order.' Much of what is there urged as to the drawbacks of the present system and the need for the grouping of parishes will command widespread support; but it is crossed, and in our judgment fatally vitiated, by a policy of administrative centralisation and financial equalisation to which there are the strongest objections.* From the financial point of view, it is not likely that a policy which begins by the diversion of trust funds, often of quite recent donation, to purposes for which they were not given, will inspire the public with confidence and lead to the supply of new money for the Church; and many large parishes whose endowments are at present perhaps adequate for a sufficient staff would in future have no security for their income. Administratively, the calculation of allowances would involve the creation of a new bureaucratic department, with branches presumably in every diocese; while the parson, who even if poor is at least a free and self-respecting person, would have to go hat in hand to the officials for every variation in the allowances that he needed. When the financial side of the policy has turned the English priesthood into a £300-a-year job, its administrative provisions will certainly see to it that only £300-a-year men will apply for it! Finally, the inevitable result of canvassing the Church in favour of such a policy would be to turn the attention of clergy and people alike from a great spiritual opportunity and great spiritual tasks to the pettifogging business of their own domestic book-keeping. Jealousies, now almost non-existent, would be created and exploited; the service of tables would supplant, in scores of cases, the service of the Word and sacraments; and amid the general bewilderment due to this attempt to apply communistic principles to the estate of the clergy, at a time when communism has been

* Briefly, the policy is that all parochial endowments should be pooled, and that all priests should be paid a guaranteed minimum salary (£200 is suggested) *plus* variable increments and allowances.

rejected everywhere else (even in Russia), we may take it as certain that there would be neither men nor money forthcoming for the work of the Ministry.

In conclusion, something may be said about the influence which the Church may be expected to exercise in shaping the new order of the future. There is a widespread desire that Christianity should be more fully applied to national and international life. Public opinion does not regard it as an accident that the chaos of our times has come as a climax to seventy years of advancing secularism. Order is founded upon obedience, and it is not likely that men will render obedience to anything less than the will of God. At the same time the Church is precluded, both by the nature of its own mission and by the complexity of the problems which have to be faced, from anything like direct political action. It is bound to emphasise social needs when these militate against the 'good life,' and to proclaim the Christian principles which it wishes to see applied; but the framing of policy calls for the skill of the statesman and the administrator.

We may sum up the nature of the Church's mission by saying that it is concerned more with the quality of life than with the standard of living. Its quality of life springs from three roots. One is an enrichment of the spirit of man by the Spirit of God, which so strengthens the whole personality that it refuses to be treated as a mere nucleus of economic or political relationships, and insists that it is a living soul. That is why every form of totalitarianism falls foul of Christianity and ends by persecuting it. Another root is the sacramental attitude to human relationships and events which flows from the Christian doctrines of the Creation and the Incarnation. Nature and nature's doings, especially birth, marriage, and death, are given a peculiar seriousness and sacredness: family life, for instance, when it has the Christmas story in the background, inevitably has a savour of its own. It was not among the advanced medical students of Berlin, but in a remote village of Catholic Silesia, that the brilliant free-thinking American doctor, who interrogated James Martineau, found the greatest wisdom in living and the deepest understanding of life's experiences.* The third

* The story is told by Baron Von Hügel in 'Essays and Addresses,' 2nd Series, pp. 126-129.

root is the expectation of a future life, and the acceptance of life on earth as a state of probation, an element of the Christian creed which, for all its other-worldliness, inspired such notable reformers as St Francis, William Wilberforce, and Lord Shaftesbury.

In our own times we may expect to see this aspect of the Church's witness bear fruit especially in the problems of education and of agriculture. It will affect education not only through the high value it sets on religious teaching, and the training in worship which gives it point, but also through its view about the true aim of education, which is not the production of success in competition, but of wholeness of personality. The whole trend of our present educational system is towards the production of 'black-coated' workers: in a Hampshire village recently, where part of a London school is evacuated, the local boys have been greeted by their London guests with the mocking words, 'Here come the country bumpkins!' So far as rural areas are concerned, something would be done by raising from eleven to thirteen the age at which children passed from primary to senior or secondary schools. Meanwhile, the decapitation of country schools through the removal elsewhere of children at the age of eleven is effecting a silent revolution in our villages, which is little short of disastrous.* Rarely in English legislation can living realities have been so ruthlessly sacrificed to theory, and the needs of whole communities subordinated to the departmental mind. One cries aloud for an hour of William Cobbett or John Ruskin!

The Church's interest in agriculture arises similarly from its care for quality of life. Not only is a village a complete social structure, where every man, woman, and child is a real person and each knows every other; but its sense of unity and the persistence of its traditions, its realism and its good manners, nourish a wisdom which is three-fourths of life. During the war it has shown that it can tackle even the dregs of the city proletariat and teach their children how to be clean and decent.

* The Bishop of Salisbury in his Primary Visitation Charge, 'Watch and Ward,' thus expresses himself on it: 'My own opinion is that, taking the whole scheme by and large, hardly anything could have been devised more calculated to destroy in the normal child at its most impressionable age its affection for country life, the attraction of Nature and the cultivation of the land.' And he speaks from close knowledge of two counties.

That is why many of us believe that the future welfare of our country depends upon the regeneration of the countryside. The soul-less routine of the machine, which robs so much of modern industry of any motive, cannot be dealt with unless we first de-urbanise a large part of our population and bring them again to the country. The political and economic means to this end are for agriculturists and politicians to devise; but no means will be too drastic that result in giving fresh heart to our soil and fresh souls to our people.

A like warning is needed in regard to all economic problems: we have to recognise that every functional group in society has its own relative ethics, and must work out its own way of applying Christian principles to its work. The point may be illustrated by the attacks now frequently being made in ecclesiastical circles on profits and the profit-maker in industry, as though they were something disreputable. As to the best methods of distributing profits, there is room for many opinions; but as to the necessity of *making* profits, there can be none at all. Steady and rising profits are an index of two things, efficiency and public service; and both are often explicitly approved in the teaching of Christ. The alternative, moreover, to making profits is the lugubrious business of making losses: there is no static point of equilibrium. And if profits need to be made in the public interest, what is dishonourable in the desire to make them? True, the efficient business man hopes to benefit himself and his children as well as the community: but why should he not? 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself': the golden rule leaves a place for a reasonable self-love. Christian character is shown not in the absence of self-interest, but in that combination of self-interest with other interests which we call a sense of responsibility; and in that sphere there is room for every gradation of unselfishness and self-sacrifice. Our Lord's teaching seems clear on the point. In the Parable of the Talents it is not the man who abstained from profit-making, but the men who laid out their wealth to the best advantage, whose conduct is approved. And there is more here than a justification of economic profits: the men are accountable to their lord. So under modern conditions is the business man, when he renders account of his profits to the Chan-

cellor of the Exchequer. And the Chancellor sees to it that a very large part of them goes to the service of the common weal. By all means let Company Law be improved so that rascality and corruption may be diminished. By all means let rapacity and naked individualism be bridled. But let us beware of urging the Church to pronouncements or actions based on only superficial knowledge, and of identifying Christianity with particular projects of reform.

Finally, Christian people cannot forget that the greatest gift which they have received, and which they have to impart to the world, is the gift of charity. One of the few compensations which the war has yielded for the havoc and misery it has caused is the cessation of political strife at home and the spirit of unity animating our people. The Prime Minister has already intimated that post-war problems cannot be tackled with any hope of success unless this spirit continues; and the whole weight of the Church should surely be thrown on the same side. The necessary tasks of reconstruction alone, not least the rebuilding of homes and churches and the restoration of personal liberties, will be so obvious and so urgent that there will be no place for revolutionary theories or class-warfare if the welfare of the people is to come first. Nor can the spirit of charity, which Christianity fosters, be limited to our own country. We hold a faith which is of œcumenical authority, and are bound to join hands with all others who hold it the whole world over. I am one of those who believe that the foundations of peace will not be truly laid unless the main criminals of the German Reich are brought before judicial tribunals and duly sentenced: the vindication of international law requires the punishment of those who wantonly break it. But though justice must provide the foundations of peace, the edifice cannot rise without grace. Mr Mumford, in 'Faith for Living,' dwells on the immense fruitfulness of the grace shown by the Russian aristocracy when it freed the Russian serfs: he might have cited a more recent instance in the spirit which inspired and followed the Treaty of Vereeniging after the South African War. Only a great generosity can restore the shattered intercourse and build up again the mutual trust of nations. And such generosity cannot come save from the Spirit and grace of God.

E. G. SELWYN.

SOME RECENT BOOKS.

A Picture of Life, 1872-1940. Viscount Mersey, C.M.G., C.B.E.

The Roots of National Socialism. Rohan D'O. Butler.

Legal Miscellanies. Henry W. Taft.

The North Star and Other Poems. Laurence Binyon.

The British Constitution. Ivor Jennings, D.Litt.

German versus Hun. Carl Brinitzer and Berthe Crossbard.

Diplomacy and God. George Glasgow.

The Cambridge History of Poland.

LORD MERSEY in his 'A Picture of Life, 1872-1940' (Murray) tells of an exceptionally varied and interesting career. He has always had a strong inclination for travel and adventure in unusual places and for intellectual work out of the usual run. All his life he has been lucky enough to be able to indulge his inclinations, thanks largely in his younger days to a generous and understanding father, gratitude to and appreciation of whom are one of the attractive features of the book. This indulgence had to be paid for with hard work, perseverance, determination, and disregard of danger, but these are qualities in which Lord Mersey has never been deficient. After a conventional education at Cheam and Eton, Clive Bigham, as he then was, joined the Grenadier Guards, but the routine military, social, and sporting life of a Guardsman held but little appeal for him and he soon sought opportunities in wider fields of action—and found them. In Russia he more or less invented for himself the post of Honorary Military Attaché which gave him remarkable experiences in that stupendous country. He saw service in the Balkan wars as 'The Times' correspondent, and in a fighting capacity in China at the time of the Boxer rebellion. Between 1914 and 1919 he had staff work at home, in Egypt, and of a very special character in Paris. He was in Gallipoli and very nearly lost his life in the sinking of the 'Persia.' He has travelled widely in Europe and Asia; he has been a successful author and a discerning collector of old books and prints, and he has made his mark in business. When these experiences are added to friendships with many famous people, a retentive memory, and a diary habit, readers will soon realise that all the necessary ingredients for a really good book are present, and they will assuredly not be disappointed with the result.

By writing 'The Roots of National Socialism' (Faber and Faber) Mr Rohan D'O. Butler has done little less than place the civilised world in his debt. In seven clear and extraordinarily comprehensive chapters he has proved beyond a single peradventure that National Socialism and Hitlerism are not only a direct result, logical and inevitable, of the last one hundred and fifty years of German history, but that they express the *Wesen* of the German people. Chapter I, a prologue entitled Background, is followed by Romanticism, 1783-1815; Reaction, 1815-1848; Unification, 1848-1871; Empire, 1871-1918; Republic, 1918-1933; closing with an epilogue entitled Foreground. Mr Butler examines Germany's philosophers and teachers from Luther to Hitler and, one by one, proves them guilty of believing in and teaching *Deutschland, Deutschland über alles*. Nietzsche said Germans stand for the 'moral order of the universe in history.' He gave Germans a new task: 'Become hard,' and said 'I do not exhort you to work, but to fight': 'You say that a good cause will even sanctify war! I tell you it is a good war that sanctifies every cause!' Herder, Mr Butler tells us, 'doubted if Germans did not buy Christianity at too high a price, that of nationality.' Good Germans believe in sacrificing personal happiness to national glory. Even the civilised Novalis taught that the stronger has the stronger right. National Socialism means their own special brand of Socialism for Germans at the price of slavery for the rest of the world. The ruling race must rule. Germany hates the world. All foreign thought must be Germanised before being absorbed. Hence the German ignorance of foreign psychology. The German deliberately despises reason, persuasion, gentleness: Treitschke said 'each dragoon who knocks a Croat on the head does far more for Germany than the finest political brain that ever wielded a trenchant pen'; 'the sin of weakness in politics,' he said, 'is the sin against the Holy Ghost.' Some people cannot see why good Germans must be anti-Christian. If you deny the brotherhood of man it is an inevitable step to denying the Fatherhood of God.

Mr Henry W. Taft, the eminent American lawyer, could, we feel sure, write a most interesting autobiography but in his 'Legal Miscellanies' (Macmillan) he has

deliberately chosen not to do so but, in his own words, has 'endeavoured to set forth as a result of observation and experience some of the changes which have taken place in the practice of my profession in the City of New York during the period of the last sixty years.' In this object he has succeeded well, and though there may be a good deal in the customs and practice of American law, and its essential difference from (while keeping considerable outward appearance of great similarity to) those of our law here bewildering for readers in this country, yet there is much dealing with life in New York many years ago and now, and with many cases at law with real human and dramatic interest which will please readers anywhere. There are also interesting reminiscences of country life outside New York when Mr Taft was young. His chapter on the Anti-Trust Law is a specially valuable one considering how much we hear, often incorrectly, of the war against Trusts and 'big business.' There is also an interesting chapter on Jewish lawyers in New York, giving some remarkable statistics. The chapter on will-making introduces a lighter element and one that will be enjoyed—the foibles of will-makers are, we imagine, much the same in most countries. Mr Taft finally gives some enlightening character sketches of past leaders of the New York Bar, some of whom, like Joseph Choate and Elihu Root, are well remembered in this country, even though others, no doubt undeservedly, are unknown here. Whatever throws light and understanding on the manners and customs of other countries, especially countries with which we are so closely linked as with the U.S.A., is to be welcomed, and Mr Taft's book should find warm appreciation.

Because in war time we are particularly grateful to the poets for reminders of their high office, Mr Laurence Binyon's many admirers will warmly thank him for '*The North Star and Other Poems*' (Macmillan). A highly accomplished poet rather than a poet of great accomplishment, Mr Binyon by his sensitive feeling for beauty in all her manifestations, his freshness of fancy, and his unfailing technical dexterity easily persuades us to overlook the fact that inspiration is not always at his beck and call. The title poem, dated 1938, was written under the oncreeping shadow of war; several poems are dated 1939 and

1940. 'There is still Splendour' is the poet at his characteristic best. Of the impressions of foreign travel 'Lycabettus' is perhaps the most successful and, at this cruel hour in Greek history, it has an added poignancy :

O spiring, tawny-caverned, crested white,
Pink-skirted Lycabett !
Lifting above spread roofs this craggy height,
What have you to do
With the sprawled city's modern swarm and hum,
You that have seen the ages go and come
From the first sun-rise to the last sun-set ?
When Athens wore her wondrous bloom,
Her dateless violet,
You had no ornament nor dress ;
And who had eyes for you ?
Wild earth, rude rocks ?
What history ? Only solitariness.

Dr Ivor Jennings says of his new book 'The British Constitution' (Cambridge University Press) that its aim is 'to give the ordinary citizen a readable and detached (though not of course impartial) introduction to the problems of the Governmental system in which he plays so large a part.' Undoubtedly the book is most readable, and as for its partiality, when we read of 'the cynical empiricism of the Conservative Central Office with the almost equal cynicism of Transport House' it is not difficult to deduce that the author's sympathies lie in the Liberal fold. Altogether impartial history can make dull reading ; prejudices, especially when the reader disagrees with them, stimulate thought and are welcome. The Quarterly Review cannot be expected to agree with many of Dr Jennings prejudices, though it gladly pays tribute to his literary skill and lucid arrangement and explanation of his subject, on which he writes with the authority of much thought and study. The chapter headings give a good idea of the scope of the work : Government by the People, Government by Party, the House of Commons, the House of Lords, the Monarchy, Administration, Cabinet Government, Government in War Time, and British Democracy. The examination of proportional representation and the alternative vote and the conclusion that their disadvantages are greater than their advantages is specially interesting, and Conservative

readers at least will find entertainment in the examination of the House of Lords, Dr Jennings' great dislike of which he takes no pains to conceal.

There could, presumably, be compiled in any country a collection of uncomplimentary judgments delivered by its more famous sons but, surely, in no other country could that collection be so devastatingly condemnatory as in Germany. Carl Brinitzer and Berthe Crossbard have ransacked German history and literature for their anthology of horrors : '**German versus Hun**' (George Allen and Unwin). Instinctively one turns first to Goethe because he was both characteristic of Germany at its best and was a universal genius.

We may feel it judicious to set aside as likely to be biased charges against Germans made by famous Jews such as Heine, Schiller, Thomas Mann, Zweig, Emile Ludwig, and Meier-Gräfe ; we are, however, forced to accept them as just and authentic when vouched for by such names like Schopenhauer, Kant, Nietzsche, Bismarck, Wagner, Mommsen, Scharnhorst, Treitschke, Tirpitz, and scores of others. Because it is a damning indictment of themselves by famous and patriotic citizens, this is a frightening book. It was a mistake to include the six passages, however apposite, from the writings of Daisy Princess of Pless. Although married to a Prussian, resident in Germany for nearly half a century, and knowing Germans thoroughly, that distinguished lady remains incorrigibly English. A few quotations must conclude an inadequate note on a book for which Mr Duff Cooper desires a wide circulation, and of which he says : ' Out of their own mouths let them be judged.' Goethe wrote : ' I know the Germans well ; first they are silent, then they haggle, then they turn away, then they steal and dissemble.' (In these bitter words are enshrined the whole history of Hitler's Germany.) There lies hope, perhaps, as well as condemnation in the following grim words of Heine : ' To you, a countryman, I can say without embarrassment that our compatriots never had any character, and were never a nation, but only a mixed mob, which any wordy rascal can rule, whose insolence is merely aggravated by compliance, but which sings small if we take severe measures against it.' The day on which their present ' wordy rascal ' shall ' sing small ' is coming.

Mr George Glasgow's 'Diplomacy and God' (Longmans) is one of those disappointing 'Way Out of' productions that so seldom live up to their—usually provocative—titles. In two hundred and thirty pages we are to learn the way out of nothing less final than 'Chaos' itself! The author is an able and well-known publicist and writer, but his argument is based on the unwarranted assumption that Statesmanship and what he calls 'high diplomacy' are, and always have been, bereft of Christians and contemptuous of Christian principles. He denounces the *entente cordiale* as a piece of heartless cynicism and, instead of censuring England for not having sooner stood up to German aggressiveness, says that we should never have done so at all!

On page 33 Mr Glasgow asks: 'What Englishman in his heart would not, if he could, revert to the European situation which existed before 1914? Yet how many Englishmen would at this moment be prepared to pocket their national pride and say: "We were wrong in 1914 to join issue with Germany; we were wrong in 1919 to impose upon Germany some of the penalties, for instance the loss of her colonies, that were presented in the Treaty of Versailles; therefore we are prepared to revert to the *status quo ante* 1914"?'

Fortunately for the future of that Christian civilisation for which Mr Glasgow is so rightly and so sincerely concerned few such Englishmen exist. To put on a white sheet, as he wants us to do, and proclaim to the world that we were wrong in 1914, 1920, and again in September 1939, would be to deny not only the truth, but all truth.

In the preface to 'The Cambridge History of Poland' (Cambridge University Press) we are told that it is to be completed in two volumes, and owes its origin to the prevision of the late greatly lamented Professor Harold Temperley to whose memory it is dedicated. The conception was both fine and timely, and Temperley (as was his way) gathered round him a notable group of collaborators including Messrs W. F. Reddaway, J. H. Penson, O. Halecki, and R. Dyboski. The present volume is really the second of the project and covers Polish history from 1697 until the death of Pilsudski in 1935. Even well-read people know little of Polish history in its involved and perplexing splendour. This ignorance

must be remedied if we are to cherish a reasonable hope that, after the present war, the Polish problem will be satisfactorily resolved. In the fifteen chapters of this timely volume will be found all the relevant factors set forth with objective accuracy. The brave glory of the Polish patriots and Polish history is apt to blur our sense of Polish failures and shortcomings, here duly recorded. Professor Skwarczyński of Lublin deals with the constitution before the Partitions and Professor W. J. Rose of London with the social life of that period. Professor W. F. Reddaway handles brilliantly the First and Second Partitions; Professor Dembiński covers the age of Stanislas Augustus and the National Revival; and no one could handle Napoleon and Poland better than Professor Holland Rose. Dr A. P. Coleman of Columbia covers The Great Emigration, the period of Alexander II, and the Insurrection of 1863, and Dr B. E. Schmitt of Chicago The Polish Problem in International Politics—a very acute and far-seeing contribution; the late Miss Monica Gardner illuminates the fascinating question of Polish Romanticism, and Lord Kennet closes the History with a study of the difficult personality of Pilsudski: there is not space even to mention other contributors equally distinguished. It is sufficient to say that the volume is worthy of its title and its publication under such unassailable authority an event of international importance. The three maps are excellent, but the index merely adequate.

INDEX

TO THE

TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH VOLUME OF THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.

[Titles of Articles are printed in heavier type. The names of authors of articles are printed in italics.]

A.

Acton, Lord, on 'Prussianism,' 135.
Addison, Joseph, 107.
Africa, The War and North East, 56-69.
Agar, Herbert, 155.
Agriculture, Birds and, 218-232.
Albert, Prince Consort, 167-168, 173.
Alexander, H. G., 259.
Alexandra, Queen, 172.
Amery, L. S., 261 note, 262, 271.
Aosta, Duke of, 63 note.
Arnold, G. F., 'Psychology applied to Legal Evidence,' 55.
'Asiatic Reviews, The (East India Association),' 256.
Asquith, Earl of Oxford and, 5, 170-171.
Atkinson, Lord, 38.
Attlee, Rt Hon. C. R., 157.
Auchinleck, General Sir Claud, 271.

B.

Balbo, General, 95.
Balfour, 1st Earl of, 2, 170-171.
Balfour, Capt. Harold, 103.
Barker, Dr Ernest, 'Ideas and Ideals of the British Empire,' 148-149.
Barton, Sir William, 268.
Beaverbrook, Lord, 24, 103.
Beddell, C. E. A., 'The General Hospital Service,' 243.
de Beer, G. R., 'Embryos and Ancestors,' 70, 72 note.
Begg, Demaree, joint author of 'In Search of Soviet Gold,' 81, 85.
Bennett, Arnold, 111.

Bennett, Rt Hon. R. B., 37-38.
Bentley, E. C., 'Trent's Last Case,' 154, 159.
Berzin, General, 82, 91.
Bethmann-Hollweg, Theodore von, on Edward VII, 172.
Bevin, Rt Hon. Ernest, 17.
Binyon, Laurence, 'The North Star and Other Poems,' 290-291.
Birds and Agriculture, 218-232.
Bismarck, Prince, 208-209, 211, 239, 241.
Blücher, Princess, 171-172.
Blyton, W. J., 'The Response to Crisis: Some Contrasts,' 105.
Books, Some Recent, 144-150, 288-294.
Bose, S. C., 256.
Bourinot, Sir John, 39.
Boutmy, Emile, 36.
Brand, Hon. R. H., 'Union of South Africa,' 34.
Brintzer, Carl, joint author of 'German versus Hun,' 292.
Britain at War, 14-26, 151-165.
Brousson, J. J., 50.
Browne, Sir Thomas, 'Urn Burial,' 'Religio Medici,' 106.
Bryant, Arthur, 3.
Bryce, Lord, 'Modern Democracies,' 27—on German atrocities, 142, 169.
Buchan, John (Lord Tweedsmuir), 6.
Bukharin, 91.
Bülów, Prince von, 174-176, 209, 211-212, 215.
Burke, Edmund, 107, 266.
Butler, Dr Nicholas Murray, 15, 156.
Butler, Rohan D'O., 'The Roots of National Socialism,' 289.

Butler, Samuel, 'Life and Habit,' 70, 72-74—'Unconscious Memory,' 75.

Byron, Lord, 109.

C.

Calvin, John, 237-238.

'Cambridge History of Poland, The,' 293-294.

Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 170-171.

Carl of Denmark, Prince, later Haakon, King of Norway, 32.

Carnarvon, Earl of, 34.

Carraway, A. P., 'The Failure of Federalism in Australia,' 27.

Challands, F. J. S., 21-22.

Chamberlain, Houston Stuart, 130

Chamberlain, Rt Hon. Joseph, 170, 173-175, 212, 215.

Chamberlain, Rt Hon. Neville, 158.

Charles II, 168-169, 192.

Chatham, 1st Earl of, 24.

Chirol, Sir Valentine, author of draft of article 'The Earlier Years of Kaiser Wilhelm,' 207, 215.

Church and the Outlook, The, 274-287.

Church, Social Reform in the, 115-124.

Churchill, Winston, 24, 105, 151, 155, 158, 161-162, 164, 166, 287.

City Churches, The Work and Future of the, 192-206.

Cobbett, W., 114.

Coleridge, S. T., 110.

Collishaw, Air Commodore, 100.

'Cope, John,' on cancer, 249.

Cowie, Donald, 'The British Contribution,' 147-148.

Cowper, William, 108-109, 113.

Croce, Benedetto, 'History as the Story of Liberty,' 146-147.

Crossbard, Berthe, joint author of 'German versus Hun,' 292.

Curzon, Marquess, 162.

D.

Darlan, Admiral, 154, 158.

Darton, F. J. Harvey, 76.

Decline and Fall of Roman Air Power, 95-104.

De Quincey, 109, 114, 131.

Desai, Mahadev, 'Maulana Abul Kalam Azad—President of the Indian National Congress,' 256, 258-260.

Desborough, Lady, 49-50.

Desborough, Lord, 49.

Dickens, Charles, on the City Churches, 192, 194, 198.

Dictatorship, A Henchman of Stalin: Sidelights on, 81-94.

Dixon, W. Macneile, 'The Human Situation,' 70, 79 note.

Dryden, John, 'Annus Mirabilis,' 107.

Ducat, Andrew, 25.

Dunbar, Sir George, 'India at War: A Record and a Review, 1939-40' .. 256, 272.

Durai, J. Chinna, 'The Choice before India,' 256, 263, 268-269.

E.

Earlier Years of Kaiser Wilhelm, The, 207-217.

Eckardstein, Baron von, 175-176, 215.

Edward VII, King, 3, 5-6, 10, 13, 166-179, 216.

Edward VIII, King, Pollock on abdication of, 46.

Edwards, O., 'Japanese Plays and Playfellows,' 53.

Egerton, H. E., 'Federations and Unions in the British Empire,' 27.

Eulenberg, Prince Philip, 209.

F.

Federalism, Problems of, 27-43.

Fichte, J. G., 135.

Fisher, H. A. L., 18.

Fisher, Admiral Lord, 170.

Ford, Henry, 155.

Foxcroft, H. C., 'A Henchman of Stalin: Sidelights on Dictatorship,' 81.

Francis Joseph II, Emperor, 32, 179.

Frederick, Emperor, 207-208.

Frederick, Empress, 207-208, 216.

Frederick the Great, 126, 235-236, 238-239.

Freeman, E. A., 'History of Federal Government,' 29.

French Military Training for
Defeat, 180-191.
Frere, Sir Bartle, 34.
Freud, Sigmund, 75-76.
Fundamentals, 70-80.

G.

Gamelin, General, 182.
Gandhi, Mahatma, 256-263, 266, 268, 273.
de Gaulle, General, 158, 182, 189.
General Hospital Service, The, 243-255.
George V, King, 1-13.
Georges, General, 182-183.
Germany as a Spiritual and World Problem, 233-242.
Gibbon, Edward, 108, 113.
Glasgow, George, 'Diplomacy and God,' 293.
Goebbels, Dr, 132, 155.
Goldsmith, Oliver, 107-108.
Goodwin, Dr, 106.
Gore, Bishop, 279.
Gore, John, 'King George V,' 1-6, 8-9, 11-12.
Gorell, Lord, C.B.E., M.C., 'Britain at War,' 14 and 151.
Göring, Hermann, 103.
Gray, Thomas, 107.
Graziani, Marshal, 99.
Grey, Sir Edward, later Viscount, 172.
Grey, Sir George, 33-34.
Grigg, Sir James, 257-258.

H.

Haig, Sir Harry, 265.
Hailé Selassié, Emperor of Abyssinia, 63-64, 66-67, 69.
Hailey, Lord, 'An African Survey,' 61-62, 266, 269-270, 272.
Haldane, Lord, 39, 170.
Halifax, Lord, 15.
Hambleden, late Lord, 243.
Hamilton, Alexander, 35.
Harden, Max, 209.
Hardy, Eric, F.Z.S., 'Birds and Agriculture,' 218-'Birds of the Liverpool Area,' 218.
Hardy, Thomas, 111, 113.

'Harpole, James,' 249.
Hartog, Professor Marcus, preface to Butler's 'Unconscious Memory,' 75.
Hawkins, 'My Friend the Rook,' 218.
Hearnshaw, Professor, 167.
Hegel, 135, 234-235.
Henchman of Stalin, A: Side-lights on Dictatorship, 81-94.
Herbert, George, 'Temple,' 106.
Hering, E., 'Das Gedächtniss als allgemeine Funktion der organisierten Materie,' 70, 72, 76.
Hess, Rudolf, 14, 16.
Heywood, General Cecil, 190.
Hitler, 83-87, 90-91, 103, 135, 138-139, 153-154, 158-159, 161, 165, 192, 234, 236, 241.
Hobbes, Thomas, 'Leviathan,' 185.
Holmes, Dr Oliver Wendell, 44, 46-47, 52.
Holmes, Oliver Wendell, junior, 44-55.
'Holmes-Pollock Letters, The,' 44.
von Holstein, Baron, 175-176, 215.
Hopkins, Harry, 155.
Hopkinson, Lt-Colonel Austin, 162.
Horton, Walter Marshall, 'Contemporary English Theology,' 274.
Hospital Service, The General, 243-255.
Howe, Professor Mark de Wolfe, 48.
Hunt, Leigh, 109-110.

I.

Indian Politics, 1940-41..256-273.
Inge, Very Rev. W. R., 'Nationalism and National Character,' 125
Innocent III, Pope, 134.

J.

James I, 134-135.
James, Henry, 51, 54.
James, William, 54.
Jennings, Dr Ivor, 'A Federation for Western Europe,' 27-'The British Constitution,' 291-292.
Jinnah, Mr, 258, 262, 264-265.
Johnson, Dr Samuel, 107.
Jouett, Colonel J. H., 104.
Jung, C. G., 75-76, 79.

K.

- Kaiser Wilhelm, *The Earlier Years of*, 207-217.
 Keats, John, 110.
Kennedy, Capt. A. L., M.C., 'The Earlier Years of Kaiser Wilhelm,' 207.
 Kennedy, Gen. Sir John, 190.
 Kennedy, Studdart, 118.
 Kennedy, W. P. M., 'The Nature of Canadian Federalism,' 27.
 King Edward VII. *See* Edward.
 King George. *See* George.
 Kipling, R., 111.
 Kirov, Sergei, 91-92.
 Krivitsky, W. C., 'I was Stalin's Agent,' 81-87, 89-94.
 Krüger, Paul, 174, 210, 212.

L.

- Lamb, Charles, 109-110.
 Lamb, Henry, on the rebuilding of London, 193.
 Lang, Andrew, 52.
 Lang, Archbishop Cosmo Gordon, 6, 12.
 Lansdowne, Marquess of, 172-173, 175, 215.
 Lapie, Capitaine Pierre O., 'With the Foreign Legion at Narvik,' 150.
 Lascelles, Sir Frank, 213.
 Lawrence, late Sir Walter, 5.
 Lee, Sir Sidney, 175.
 Leeson, Canon, 23.
 Leighton, Lord, 168.
 Lenin, 90-91.
 Lindsay, Kenneth, M.P., 23.
 Linlithgow, Marquess of, 258, 261, 271.
 Lippman, Walter, 156-157.
 Littlepage, John D., joint author of 'In Search of Soviet Gold,' 81, 85.
 Litvinov, 86.
 Livingstone, Sir Richard, 'The Future of Education,' 274.
Lloyd, Canon Roger, 'Social Reform in the Church,' 115.
 Lloyd George, David, 170.
 Long, Walter, afterwards Lord, 169.
Lovett, Sir Verney, K.C.S.I., 'Indian Politics, 1940-41'... 256.
 Luther, Martin, 115, 133, 237-238.

M.

- MacDonald, Rt Hon. Ramsay, 12, 268.
 McDougall, Dr W., 75.
Malcolm, Sir Ian, K.C.M.G., 'King George V,' 1.
 Malet, Sir Edward, 210.
 Manning, Dr (Bishop of New York), 156.
 Marlowe, Christopher, 106.
Marriott, Sir John, 'Problems of Federalism,' 27—'The Tragedy of Europe,' 144.
 Marvell, Andrew, 106, 138.
 Mary, Queen, 4-7.
 Mead, Senator James, 155.
 Menelik, Emperor, 64, 67.
 'Men, Money and the Ministry' Group of Anglican Clergy, 'Putting Our House in Order,' 115, 283.
 Menzies, Sir Frederick, 246.
 Menzies, Rt Hon. R. G., 17.
 Meredith, George, 50-52.
 Mersey, Viscount, 'A Picture of Life, 1872-1940'... 288.
 Meston, Lord, 'Nationhood for India,' 256.
 Mill, J. S., 43.
 Milton, John, 106, 113.
 Morley, Lord, 51, 263-264.
Müller-Sturmheim, E., 'Germany as a Spiritual and World Problem,' 233.
 Mumford, Lewis, 'Faith for Living,' 274-275, 287.
 Mussolini, 15, 57, 95, 99, 135, 139-140.

N.

- Napoleon III, 172.
 Nationalism and National Character, 125-143.
 Nehru, Pandit Jawahirlal, 266-267.
 Newstead, 'Food of Wild Birds,' 218.
 'New Testament in Basic English, The,' 144-145.
 Nicholaiev, Leonid, 91-92.
 Nuffield, Lord, 252.

O.

- O'Dwyer, Sir Michael, 'India under the Congress,' 267 note.
 'Official Reports of Parliamentary Debates,' 256.

Oscar, King of Sweden, 32.
Owen, Dr John, 106.

P.

Palfrey, John G., 45, 48, 52.
Palmerston, Lord, 172.
Pariani, General, 95.
Parkin, Sir G. R., 'Imperial Federation,' 27.
'P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning) Report on the British Health Services as to London,' 248, 255.
Petrie, Sir Charles, Bart, 'King Edward VII,' 166.
Poincaré, Raymond, and Edward VII, 177.
Pollock, Sir Frederick, 44-52, 54-55.
Pollock, Lady (Georgina), 49-50, 53-54.
Pollock, Sir John, Bart, 'The Pollock-Holmes Correspondence,' 44.
Pollock, Lady (Juliet), 46.
Pollock, Sir W. F., 46-47.
Pollock, Walter Herries, 46.
Pollock-Holmes Correspondence, *The*, 44-55.
Polonius, Alexander, 'I Saw the Siege of Warsaw,' 145-146.
Polson Newman, Major E. W., 'The War and North-East Africa,' 56.
Problems of Federalism, 27-43.
Prussia, Prince Henry of, 212, 214.

Q.

Quick, Sir J., 'The Legislative Powers of the Commonwealth and the States of Australia,' 27.
Quickwood, Lord, 23.
Quisling, 180.

R.

Radek, M., 86.
Raeder, Admiral, 26.
Rashid Ali Gillani, 26, 266.
Rattray, R. F., Ph.D., 'Fundamentals,' 70.
Reade, Charles, 'The Cloister and the Hearth,' 159.
Reed, Sir Stanley, 266.

Reid, Whitelaw and Edward VII, 178.
Reitz, F. W., 34.
Renan, Ernest, 50, 125.
'Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations,' 27.
Response to Crisis, The: Some Contrasts, 105-114.
Reynolds, Quentin, 155.
Rhondda, Lord, 24.
Ribbentrop, Paul von, 86.
Richardson, Rev. Alan, 'The Miracle Stories of the Gospels,' 276 note.
Richmond, Admiral Sir Herbert, 'British Strategy, Military and Economic,' 148.
Roberts, Earl, 214.
Roman Air Power, Decline and Fall of, 95-104.
Roosevelt, President Franklin D., 17, 26, 154-155, 165.
Roosevelt, President Theodore, and Edward VII, 178.
'Royal Central Asian Journal, The,' 256.
Rykov, M., 93.

S.

Salisbury, Marquess of, 170, 173-174, 210, 212-213, 215.
Samuel, Viscount, 33.
Sandars, Rt Hon. J. S., 170.
Sapru, Sir Tej Bahadur, 271.
Scott, Sir Walter, 109, 112.
Sewell, Lt-Colonel J. P. C., 166.
Shakespeare, 106, 113.
Shelley, Percy Bysshe, 109.
Sheridan, R. B., 107.
Shinkichi, Dr, on the mission of the Japanese Empire, 135.
Sinclair, Sir Archibald, 102-103.
Skobline, General, 94.
Smith, Sydney, 197, 202.
Social Reform in the Church, 115-124.
Some Recent Books, 144-150, 288-294.
Spaight, J. M., C.B., C.B.E., 'Decline and Fall of Roman Air Power,' 95.
Spender, J. A., 'Men and Things,' 267.
Stamfordham, Lord, 11.
Steed, Wickham, 140.

Stephen, Leslie, 46.
 Stockmar, Baron, 167.
 Stuart, Sir Louis, 'Indian News
 Sheets for 1941,' 256.
 Swinburne, A., 110-111.
 Swing, Raymond Gram, 155.
 Sysonby, Lord, 208.

T.

Taft, Henry W., 'Legal Miscellanies,'
 289-290.
 Tennyson, Lord, 20, 25, 110.
 Thackeray, W. M., 110.
 Tollemache, Brigadier E. D. H., D.S.O.,
 M.C., 'French Military Training
 for Defeat,' 180.
 Trotsky, Léon, 88, 93.
 Tuchnachevsky, Marshal, 93.
 Turnor, Christopher, 'Yeoman Call-
 ing,' 274.
 Tyrrell, Father, 276.

U

Unishevsky, Vladimir, 'Red Pilot—
 Memoirs of a Soviet Airman,'
 81-82.

V.

Vaughan, Henry, 106-107.
 'Verrina,' 'The German Mentality,'
 149-150.

Victoria, Queen, 3, 13, 207, 212, 214,
 216.
 Voroshilov, Marshal, 83, 93-94.

W.

Wall, Rev. James, 'The Work and
 Future of the City Churches,' 192.
 War and North-East Africa, The,
 56-69.
 Wavell, General Sir Archibald, 14,
 24, 152 note, 190, 271.
 White, Gilbert, 108, 113.
 Whitehead, Professor, 71.
 Wigram, Lord, 11-12.
 Wilhelm II, Kaiser, and Edward VII,
 172, 174-176.
 Willingdon, Marquess of, 268, 272-
 273.
 Wilson, General Sir Maitland, 190.
 Wilson, President Woodrow, 156.
 Winchester, The Dean of, 'The Church
 and the Outlook,' 274.
 Wolfe, James, 108, 112.
 Wood Jones, Professor, 72.
 Wordsworth, William, 110.
 Work and Future of the City
 Churches, The, 192-206.
 Wren, Sir Christopher, 193-195.
 Wrench, Sir Evelyn, 128.
 Wright, T. P., 104.

Z.

Ziegler, Leopold, on the German
 national character, 237.

END OF THE TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SEVENTH VOLUME

World News by Magazine

This has been our business for over seventy years and we feel competent to give you the service which you desire.

We are the largest and most reliable agency for prompt delivery of Foreign and Domestic Periodicals in this Country.

The latest English, Irish and German Publications we carry in stock.

We call especial attention to the beautiful Christmas Editions, forming a group of magazines that have a peculiar interest to people of culture.

Our subscription prices include postage to all parts of the United States, Cuba, Mexico, Porto Rico and P. I.

Our BACK NUMBER DEPT. can furnish quick service in supplying you with old issues.

For quick and efficient service send your orders for Foreign Publications to

THE INTERNATIONAL NEWS COMPANY

Division of THE AMERICAN NEWS COMPANY, INC.

131 Varick Street, New York City

Send for Price List

ME
P3

